

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thy Kindly Light, with the encircling gloom about us, lead Thou us on.

We grope forward with uncertain steps, in a time tingling with tension and dark with fears.

Help us to trust the faithful stars above us and the glow on the far horizon, where the gates of dawn await the day of brotherhood.

May the poisoning evils which blight the earth not devastate our inner life, subduing us to its low standards, confusing us by its chaos, or crushing our faith under its tragedy.

Help us to face the piercing truth of the question—

Why build these cities glorious,

If man unbuilded goes,

In vain we build the world, unless

The builder also grows?

Growing in moral and spiritual stature, grant us honesty in dealing with our own besetting sins, humility in confessing them, and resolution in overcoming them. Grant us Thy grace to walk circumspectly, not as foolish, but as wise, redeeming the time because the days are evil.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 20, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2771) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 11040. An act to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11544. An act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farm-

ers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11619. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11714. An act to extend for 3 years the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect of transfers of distilled spirits for purposes deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1034. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish; and

H. R. 9739. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 11040. An act to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11544. An act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 11619. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

H. R. 11714. An act to extend for 3 years the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect of transfers of distilled spirits for purposes deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense; to the Committee on Finance.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees and a special committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services;

The Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

The Veterans Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary;

The Special Committee on Lobbying Activities;

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; and

The Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Glen L. Strange, to be postmaster at Tonkawa, Okla., vice H. J. Barclay, retired; James F. Houser, Jr., to be postmaster at Newkirk, Okla., vice E. C. Lucas; and Gene L. Taylor, to be postmaster at Wann, Okla., vice D. M. Bailey, resigned.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Kenneth S. Harrison for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard Reserve;

Edward J. Worrel, Jr., and sundry other persons, for appointment in the United States Coast Guard; and

Joseph P. Lushene, and sundry other persons for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

T. A. M. Craven, of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, vice Edward Mount Webster.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Garrison Norton, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nomination of Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, Director of Selective Service, to be lieutenant general, United States Army. I also report the nominations of 2 major generals in the Marine Corps to be assigned special commands in the rank of lieutenant general, as well as the names of 2 lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps to be placed on the retired list. I ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be placed on the Executive

Calendar, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The nominations are as follows:

Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, United States Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, with the rank of lieutenant general; and

Maj. Gen. Ray A. Robinson, and Maj. Gen. Merrill B. Twining, United States Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President, with the rank of lieutenant general; and

Lt. Gen. Alfred H. Noble, and Lt. Gen. William O. Brice, United States Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of lieutenant general.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in addition to the above, I report favorably 5,217 nominations in grades below flag and general officer rank involving appointment, promotion, and transfer in the Regular Army, temporary and permanent appointment and promotion in the Navy and Marine Corps, and appointment and promotion in the Regular Air Force. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Glenn A. Boger, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of David A. Hamil, of Colorado, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William G. Juergens, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Are we in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS OF OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, covering overobligations of certain appropriations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH BUSINESS FIRMS FOR WORK IN THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States, for the period July 1, 1955, through April 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN ACCESS RIGHTS TO CITY OF NEW YORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the city of New York certain rights of access in and to Marshall, John, and Little Streets, adjacent to the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CLARIFICATION OF NAVIGATION RULES FOR GREAT LAKES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Jacob Passic and Urania Antippas from reports relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on February 1, 1956, and March 15, 1956,

respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Yao Kui Chu and Francesco Iurman from reports submitted to the Senate on July 25, 1955, and January 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram, in the nature of a petition, from the Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County, Calif., signed by James S. Allison, chief clerk, relating to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, at Detroit, Mich., relating to communism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petitions of Mrs. J. A. Taylor, Mrs. Stella M. Fowler, Mrs. E. K. Rehker, Gertrude Farrell, and Mrs. Maude Sutter, all of Bloomington, Ill., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 923) to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the American Veterans of World War II and Korea, AMVETS, Department of Ohio, favoring the enactment of House bill 11357, relating to a program of scholarships for students in science and education at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the National Society of Professional Engineers, at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to navigational clearance requirements for highway and railroad bridges; to the Committee on Public Works.

The petition of Mrs. W. R. Manley, of Valyermo, Calif., relating to the reduction in age limit for women eligible for retirement benefits under the Social Security Act; ordered to lie on the table.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND CONTROL OF WATER RUNOFF—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I present a resolution which was adopted by the officers and members of the Brown County Kansas Farm Bureau, the Brown Soil Conservation District, the Walnut Creek Watershed District No. 1, and the Brown County Agricultural Council in regard to the proposed amendments to Public Law No. 566.

This program of soil conservation and the control of water runoff at its source is one program that is of real value to our area and I urge that the committee give favorable consideration to these suggestions.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIAWATHA, KANS., June 6, 1956.

We, officers and members of the Brown County Kansas Farm Bureau, the Brown County Soil Conservation District, the Walnut Creek Watershed District No. 1, and the Brown County Agricultural Council in a common meeting called to consider provisions of the proposed amendments to Public Law 566 passed by the House of Representatives and now referred to a subcommittee on agriculture of the United States Senate.

After due consideration respectfully submit to the honorable members of the subcommittee the following observations and recommendations:

Whereas, when, in compliance with the laws of Congress and the laws and regulations of the different States, the land owner and/or operator has taken all the required measures of construction of waterways, terraces, diversion ditches, building of farm ponds, seeding of waterways, and such other measures as may be required as a condition precedent to consideration of any project contemplated by Public Law 566 and any amendments thereto, the land owner and/or operator has completed all land and water management measures in which he is individually concerned therefore, all thereto are designed solely for the benefit of the general public and should be paid for out of the public treasury. Such measures as mentioned immediately above shall include procurement of all easements and construction cost of all such complementary structures as may be deemed necessary by the engineers of the Soil Conservation Service to make permanent and effective the soil and water conservation operations previously performed on the land and the major flood prevention and water retarding structures recommended by the Soil Conservation Service, in putting into effect the provisions of Public Law 566 as to be amended.

And whereas the watershed plan of development of soil and water conservation and flood prevention as contemplated under Public Law 566 is as much a matter of public interest as are larger dams constructed on main streams and rivers and perform much the same function, we submit to the honorable members of the subcommittee that all provisions applicable to the one are equally applicable to the other whether large or small, projects having the same functions should receive like treatment.

We further submit that the engineers in the Soil Conservation Service are fully capable of laying out and supervising any projects authorized under Public Law 566 and we object to any provision requiring their findings to be submitted to any other body of engineers as being unjustly derogatory of the Soil Conservation Service and a waste of time and effort.

It was stated at this meeting by members of the board of directors of the Walnut Creek Watershed District No. 1, organized under Public Law 566, that unless the recommendations enumerated above are included in the proposed amendment to the act, Walnut Creek Watershed cannot be developed under the law.

NATHAN K. BABCOCK,
Chairman, Brown County Soil Conservation District.

GLEN D. BYER,
President, Walnut Creek Watershed District No. 1.

ROBERT D. KORTHANKE,
Chairman, Brown County Agricultural Council.

JAMES W. PATTON,
President, Brown County Kansas Farm Bureau.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have long been deeply interested in assuring the closest cooperation between the management of the vast United States Post Office Department and the great numbers of its employees throughout the Nation.

I was pleased, therefore, to receive the text of a resolution, which was adopted at the convention of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, urging the establishment of labor-management committees in the Department, so as to assure the best possible working relations.

I believe this resolution will be of interest to my colleagues on the Senate Post Office Committee. I present the resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION No. 47—INTRODUCED BY DELEGATE KENNETH SLIPPER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, PIONEER BRANCH No. 2

Whereas it is the general practice in private industry to have committees representing labor and management meet on a friendly basis to iron out their difficulties; and

Whereas our National Government has insisted on the establishment of such labor-management committees; yet the Post Office Department has failed to organize such committees: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor in convention assembled in the city of Oshkosh, Wis., August 15 through 18, 1955, go on record as favoring the establishment of labor-management committees in the Post Office Department, and instruct the officers of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor to use their best efforts to assist in bringing about such legislation.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—LETTER FROM WISCONSIN STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a letter which I have received from the secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, George W. Hall.

He has urged that, as of the first pay period after March 1 of this year, the faithful postal workers of the United States be given across-the-board salary increases.

I believe the judgment of the Federation merits the earnest consideration of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE
FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Milwaukee, Wis., June 18, 1956.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Letter carriers and all postal employees have been receiving ad-

justments in salaries, long after the outside industries have advanced. The recent increase fell far short of their actual needs.

Because of the inequities we are requesting that you use your good office to assist in the support and passage of bill Nos. S. 3846 and H. R. 11116, which are companion bills. These bills provide for a \$600 cross-the-board increase, and 30 cents per hour for substitutes.

The effective date of the bill is the first day of the first pay period following March 1, 1956.

Appreciating your assistance, I am,
Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. HALL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I know my colleagues are deeply interested, as I am, in assuring a fair and sound program for the faithful members—present and past—of the Reserve forces of the United States and of the National Guard.

I present an important resolution which was adopted at the most recent annual convention of the Reserve Officers Association, Department of Wisconsin, urging the enactment of clarifying legislation in the interest of genuine equalization of benefits, as compared with that accorded to officers of the regular service.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 sought to achieve equalization of benefits as to retirement accorded Reserve and National Guard officers as compared with officers of the Regular Service; and

Whereas the Comptroller General of the United States has interpreted and ruled in effect that there is not an equalization of benefits under the act; and

Whereas there is pending before the 84th session of Congress two bills designed to bring about the enactment of legislation so clear in wording that misconstruction, ambiguity, and evasion thereof will not be possible; said bills being Senate 1643 and H. R. 6408 stating as follows:

"Sec. 8. Paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The retired pay of any officer of the Armed Forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, heretofore or hereafter retired under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 percent of the active duty pay of his rank and length of service." Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of Wisconsin, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, in convention assembled at Appleton, Wis., this 5th day of May 1956, that the Department of Wisconsin approves of and urges the passage of Senate bill 1643 and H. R. 6408 pending before the 84th Congress, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of the Wisconsin Department to all members of the Senate and House Armed Services Committee, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, and Lt. Col. Floyd Oles, USAR, secretary, Reserve Equalization Committee and Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 9828. A bill to transfer 600 acres of public domain to the Kanosh Band of Indians, Utah (Rept. No. 2279).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 3665. A bill to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands (Rept. No. 2280).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 5657. A bill to allow the use of certain property in Volusia County, Fla., for civil-defense purposes without payment of compensation to the United States (Rept. No. 2282); and

H. R. 8552. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the town of Chincoteague, Va., permanent easements on certain lands for the purpose of taking subterranean water (Rept. No. 2281).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 976. A bill to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Montgomery, W. Va. (Rept. No. 2283); and

S. 3404. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey an 11¼ acre tract of land situated in the vicinity of Williamsburg, Va., to the State of Virginia (Rept. No. 2284).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 3998. A bill to provide for the development of the Federal fish hatchery, known as the Holden trout hatchery, at Pittsford, Vt. (Rept. No. 2285).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

HELLS CANYON DAM—ADDITIONAL TIME TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on June 19, 1956, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1333) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes. At that time unanimous consent was given to file the report on June 22, 1956. I now ask unanimous consent that the time for filing the report may be extended until Tuesday, June 26, 1956, together with any separate or dissenting views submitted by members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 4095. A bill to authorize the construction of a reactor at Hanford, Wash., to produce special nuclear material and power, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 4096. A bill to establish recreational use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive study of national forest recreational use needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 4097. A bill to make it a crime to transport any person in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of committing rape upon such person, or to travel in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of committing rape upon any person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 4098. A bill for the relief of Za Lee Moh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 4099. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 4100. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorating the 250th anniversary of the founding of the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 4101. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain property of the United States heretofore conveyed to the housing authority of the city of Seattle, State of Washington; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 4102. A bill to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 4103. A bill for the relief of Cornelis Vander Hoek;

S. 4104. A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes;

S. 4105. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of United States marshals; and

S. 4106. A bill to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCLELLAN:

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing the final report of the

Commission on Government Security to June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

FURTHER EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 294) which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 154, 84th Congress, agreed to February 20, 1956 (authorizing a study of the administration of the Government employees security program), is amended by striking out "July 31, 1956" whenever it appears in such resolution and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1957."

CONSTRUCTION OF A REACTOR AT HANFORD, WASH.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of a dual-purpose reactor at Hanford, Wash.

The type of reactor proposed in this bill is unique. We hear much, Mr. President, about the value of atomic energy for both peacetime and wartime use. The dual-purpose reactor, however, is not designed to meet just one of these needs. The dual-purpose reactor combines—in one instrument—both the sword and the plowshare.

In plutonium, the dual-purpose reactor produces a material vital to our military program. Exploration of plutonium's peacetime potential has barely begun. In power, the dual-purpose reactor produces a material increasingly critical to our economic progress. The reactor proposed in my bill will produce over 200,000 kilowatts of electricity. This output can now be utilized entirely within the atomic energy works at Hanford. The drain which Hanford creates on Northwest power supplies will be correspondingly lessened. In addition, this reactor will produce isotopes for use in research, medical, and industrial applications.

By its nature, Hanford is a most appropriate location for the first dual-purpose reactor in this country. Not only can Hanford now utilize its products, but Hanford is uniquely equipped to build and operate this instrument. Costs would be greatly increased if the auxiliary services now available at Hanford had to be provided at some other site. Among the services now ready for use in this connection at Hanford are fuel fabrication and chemical processing operations, shops, warehouses, and laboratories.

Mr. President, the construction of a dual-purpose reactor at Hanford will permit revolutionary advances in our reactor technology. We know that the dual-purpose reactor is technically feasible. There is reason to believe that it is economically feasible. The only way, however, that we can perfect this reactor as a double-edged weapon for war or peace is to build one. Clearly, we can learn much from the dual-purpose reactor authorized in this bill. While we learn, we will gain material benefits in both power and plutonium.

This project, Mr. President, offers a great opportunity to capitalize on the technical advances and development at Hanford over the past decade. It provides a great opportunity to push forward the boundaries of our knowledge in the atomic field. Favorable action on this bill will mark a milestone in our progress toward the best possible use of the gifts of the nuclear age.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4095) to authorize the construction of a reactor at Hanford, Wash., to produce special nuclear material and power, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

A PROGRAM TO PROMOTE AND ENCOURAGE RECREATIONAL USE OF NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for reference to the appropriate committee, a bill to establish recreational use of the national forests of this country as a policy of Congress. My bill would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive 1-year study of national forest recreational use needs.

Original construction and provision of facilities in our national parks and forests have long since become inadequate to the vastly increased attendance in all recreational areas throughout this country by vacationers and other visitors. In the case of our national park system, this expanded use has been recognized by a major program to improve park facilities—the widely known Mission 66. The bill which I am introducing simply carries this principle over to the national forests whose facilities are equally in need of repair and expansion. Both parks and forests are essential, Mr. President.

The need for such a program for forest areas is vital. In recent years the national forests have been visited by nearly 2½ times as many people as have the national parks. For example, in 1955 it was estimated that the national forests were visited by more than 45,700,000 people, while approximately 18,800,000 people entered national parks. In my own State of Oregon, visitors to national forests in 1955 outnumbered national park visitors by 10 to 1. In that year there were 3,221,000 visitors in Oregon's national forests compared with 343,839 visitors to the Crater Lake National Park in Oregon. Campsite facilities have consequently become overcrowded and often have fallen into disrepair. These facts alone prove the necessity for an overall program of improvement for national forests.

SCENIC MAJESTY ABOUNDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS

I might mention that some time ago a related bill, of which I was a cosponsor, was introduced by my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. That bill, S. 3742, calls for a public policy to reserve areas in our great natural forested lands for public uses, including recreation. That bill would protect such great beauty spots as the

Beaver Marsh area on the upper McKenzie River where only recently the voters of the city of Eugene, Oreg., rejected a plan to destroy the natural grandeur by constructing a small power installation.

An additional bill, S. 3980, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on June 4, 1956, for himself and his colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], has recognized the same important problem as my bill does. The bill of the Senators from Montana authorizes a maximum of \$7½ million annually to be spent for the improvement of recreation areas. My bill, in directing the Secretary of Agriculture to present to Congress within 1 year a comprehensive plan for national-forest improvement, will facilitate the expenditure of any money which might be appropriated under the excellent bill of Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD.

The month of June is being observed as National Recreation Month to commemorate the 50th anniversary celebration of the National Recreation Association, an organization which, since 1906, has provided leadership in developing better recreation for the American people. Because of the role which the national forests have played in our Nation's recreational pattern, it is especially fitting at this time that we consider the future possibilities which the forests offer in enhancing recreational opportunities.

LEGISLATION WOULD ENCOURAGE NATIONAL FOREST RECREATION

The bill which I am introducing today provides for a survey and plan for the proper development of necessary facilities in our national-forest system, including such areas as might in the future be preserved for conservation and outdoor recreation.

I ask unanimous consent that along with the text of the bill there be printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the attendance records over a period of years in national parks and national forests.

Furthermore, Mr. President, let me add that I am introducing the bill for myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and table will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4096) to establish recreational use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive study of national forest recreational use needs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the fact that the national forests constitute an invaluable asset in the recreational life of the people of the United States, providing actual and potential recreational possibilities of great importance to the national economy; that use of such forests for recrea-

tional purposes, including picnicking, camping, skiing, swimming, hunting, fishing, hiking and mountain climbing is rapidly increasing, reaching an all-time high of 45.5 million visits in 1955; that visits to improved recreational areas within the national forests have almost tripled since the 1930's when most of such areas were planned and their facilities constructed in connection with Civilian Conservation Corps projects; that many of such facilities are now reaching the age where heavy maintenance and even replacement are becoming necessary; that many popular recreational areas are now regularly overcrowded and an extensive program of construction of new facilities to accommodate present use is necessary; that the continuing increase in our population emphasizes the growing need for increasing the national forest recreational opportunities with new facilities; that the national forests comprise the largest area of productive habitat for public fishing and hunting grounds in the country; and that funds available to the Department of Agriculture for providing the necessary maintenance, replacement, and construction of national forest recreational areas and facilities and for wildlife habitat management are not adequate to meet present and future needs; it is declared to be the policy of the Congress that public use of the national forests for purposes of recreation is a beneficial and proper use of such forests and that development and maintenance of areas and facilities for such public use, including maximum safety, sanitation, and wildlife habitat values, is a proper function of the Federal Government.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to initiate and carry out a comprehensive study of the personnel, funds, and other requirements necessary to develop within 5 years an adequate program for recreational use and wildlife habitat on the national forests and to provide the proper services and facilities to carry out the program. The Secretary shall within 1 year report to the Congress the results of the comprehensive study and his program recommendations including funds and any legislation necessary to permit implementation of the recommendations, such report and recommendations specifically to include provisions for (a) the development, maintenance, and operation of areas and facilities needed for public recreational use, (b) coordinating wildlife management with other resource uses and development and maintenance of wildlife habitat, and (c) adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures and facilities.

The table presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

UNITED STATES			
	Attendance		
	National Park	National Forest	
1950.....	13,918,872	27,368,000	
1951.....	15,079,165	29,950,000	
1952.....	17,142,658	33,007,000	
1953.....	17,372,080	35,403,000	
1954.....	17,968,596	40,304,000	
1955.....	18,829,541	45,713,000	

OREGON			
	Attendance		
	National Park	National Forest	
1950.....	310,796	1,778,000	
1951.....	289,286	1,907,000	
1952.....	312,677	2,275,000	
1953.....	332,835	2,413,000	
1954.....	370,554	2,803,000	
1955.....	343,839	3,221,000	

ESTABLISHMENT OF BOUNDARY BETWEEN CALIFORNIA AND ARIZONA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the people of Arizona and the people of California find themselves in a friendly dispute with respect to what constitutes the accurate and legal boundary between those two States. I am very glad the State governments of both Arizona and California have agreed the question should be amicably settled to the satisfaction of the people of the two States.

So, on behalf of myself, my able colleague, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the two able and distinguished Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. GOLDWATER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the approval by Congress of a compact to be entered into between the two States, and under which the President of the United States shall appoint an independent representative, so that the ends of justice may be fully met with respect to the problem of what constitutes the boundary between Arizona and California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4102) to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I submit two amendments which I intend to propose to H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be printed and lie on the table.

The first of these amendments, if adopted, would make military assistance funds a part of the regular Defense Department budget. For use beginning in fiscal year 1957, there would be authorized the same amount as recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee; namely, \$2,525,000,000. For subsequent years, there would be a continuing authorization of such sums as may be necessary.

Every witness on military assistance has told us that this program is an integral part of our own defense effort. It seems to me, therefore, that it should be handled in the same manner as funds for our own Armed Forces. This amendment would make that possible. It would emphasize the concept that military assistance is a part of our national defense. It would remove the inaccurate label of "foreign aid" from this part of our defense program.

The second amendment I am submitting, Mr. President, has to do with economic assistance. Instead of the \$243 million authorized by the committee bill for these purposes, my amendment would set up two loan funds. One of these would be a \$2 billion line of credit

in the Export-Import Bank available over a 3-year period for good, hard dollar loans to underdeveloped countries. The second would be a fund of \$500 million available to the International Cooperation Administration for soft loans which might be repayable in foreign currencies.

This amendment, if adopted, would put all of our foreign economic development assistance on a businesslike loan basis. Such a program not only makes more sense to the American people; I am convinced it will also make more sense to our friends abroad. The sums of money are large, but they would be used over a period of years, and they would be paid back to the United States Treasury.

It is significant that the much-talked-about Soviet economic offensive is on an all-loan basis. I believe one reason for this is that the Soviets recognize that loans are more acceptable than grants to proud, independent peoples. By putting our own program on an all-loan basis, my amendment would, in my judgment, substantially increase its effectiveness.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments, together with a series of editorials and an article dealing with my proposals may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments, editorials and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. CAPEHART to the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, viz: On page 27, in line 11, strike out "paragraphs" and insert "paragraph."

Strike out all beginning in line 12 on page 27 through line 9 on page 28 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out the purposes of this chapter not to exceed \$2,525,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1957 to remain available until expended, and thereafter there are authorized to be appropriated annually to remain available until expended such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter."

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CAPEHART to the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, viz: On pages 30 and 31, strike out all of section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 6. Title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to development assistance, is further amended by adding the following new sections:

"Sec. 203. (a) There is hereby established in the Export-Import Bank of Washington an International Development Fund of \$2 billion which shall be extended as a line of credit to the countries and non-self-governing territories of the Near East (including Greece and Turkey), Africa, Asia, and Latin America and to Spain for projects designed to promote the economic development of such countries and non-self-governing territories."

On pages 30 and 31, strike out all of section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Credits established under authority of this section shall be extended on such

terms and conditions of repayment as may be determined by the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems and with the Secretary of State: *Provided*, That all such credits shall be repayable in United States dollars.

"(c) Credits extended under authority of this section shall not be considered in determining whether the Export-Import Bank of Washington has outstanding at any one time loans and guaranties to the extent of the limitation imposed by section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526), as amended.

"(d) To carry out the purposes of this section, the Export-Import Bank of Washington is authorized to issue from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury its notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations to the extent of \$2 billion in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526), as amended, but without regard to the limitation imposed by such section on the aggregate amount of such obligations which may be outstanding at any one time.

"(e) No credits shall be extended under authority of this section after June 30, 1959, but this subsection shall not be construed as preventing the Export-Import Bank of Washington from exercising, subsequent to that date, such functions as may be necessary for the carrying out of credit agreements entered into prior to that date.

"SEC. 204. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the International Cooperation Administration not to exceed \$500 million which shall be available for loans to the countries and non-self-governing territories of the Near East (including Greece and Turkey), Africa, Asia, and Latin America and to Spain for projects designated to promote the economic development of such countries and non-self-governing territories.

"(b) Loans may be made under authority of this section under such terms and conditions of repayment, including repayment in foreign currency, as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

"(c) Amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any loan made under this section shall be held by the Treasury to be used for such purposes, including further loans, as may be authorized from time to time by Congress."

The editorials and article presented by Mr. CAPEHART are as follows:

[From the New Albany (Ind.) Tribune of May 4, 1956]

CAPEHART PLAN TO AID

Senator CAPEHART has come forward with a proposal for putting foreign aid on a business plan of administration.

Instead of administering military aid through civil agencies he would commit such aid to military authorities for proper and effective distribution and application.

Economic aid he proposes to administer through the World Bank, an institution largely financed by America and equipped with facilities, understanding, and experience for transactions with or among nations. The aid would be made accessible in 3-year credits repayable in the currency of the nations aided.

It is an unfortunate but well-known and much-discussed fact that American foreign aid has been misunderstood abroad and often in places at home and that, in its actual appreciation, there has been great waste and disappointment in material results and that considerable ill will has been engendered among foreign nations aided.

Business methods are of common understanding all over the world and the responses of honorable nations to them are fairly standard.

America's lavish gratuities—\$55 billion since 1945—in form of so-called aid have no comparable precedents in international relations. They hardly translate themselves into common understanding or an acceptable standard of response.

That condition of fact is partly attributable to the offering of aid at the outset under the Marshall plan to Russia among others and to an apparent understanding by America to nurse all nations, irresponsible of ideology and potential enmity, back to economic health. That understanding has now come to be considered an American duty and obligation to the world.

Such a conception is as fantastic as it seems to be firmly set. America, with 160 million of people and a relatively small segment of the earth, can help the other 2 billion people and the large rest of the earth. Some she can help those who help themselves enough to defend their freedom. But all she can do is to give some help. To help the most possible, all help she gives must be wisely administered and effectively used.

French Premier Mollet is not alone in his misunderstanding and complaint of aid. He suggests that American aid (American taxpayers' money) be delivered to the United Nations for administration in order to avoid possible interference by the United States in the use or mode of use of aid by recipients.

Statesmen of India complain that American aid is accompanied by some expectation of moral or other obligation on the part of the donees or some sympathy for American policies and the common cause.

The French Premier does not at all grasp the American taxpayers' point of view. The American taxpayer admits no grandiose sense of obligation to keep the world or to commit himself to some other sovereignty to do so. To give his aid to the United Nations, of which Russia is a member, in order to create a defense against Russia does not strike too favorably his sense of wisdom or his feelings.

A great deal can be said for Senator CAPEHART's plan which may reach into fields of conviction in which he has no intention to plow. It is enough that he has proposed a plan of practical businesslike merit which will effect the real purposes which aid is intended to serve or which the taxpayers desire that they serve.

His plan neither increases or decreases the extent of the aid to be given. It neither extends nor shortens the time in which America may commit itself to finance foreign aid. It coerces no nation to accept aid. It withdraws from Americans no power to exercise their will in creating aid.

It creates a circulating economic fund which is not exhausted by the first beneficiaries, but passes to others as it is replaced by the first. It will accommodate at any time and times all the billions Americans may deem desirable and possible to contribute to it.

The plan may have some flaws, but hardly any that cannot be ground out in the drafting and amending mill of Congress.

It undoubtedly will find opposition. It is the common expression that business in Washington is not businesslike and cannot be made so. We are not so certain. The income tax seems quite sternly businesslike at times. However, it is true that businessmen in Congress are constantly attempting to upset bureaucratic apple carts, protocol of authority, and fixed habits of thinking and acting.

The keen edge of the Capehart plan does cut through a lot of adipose and some proud flesh in its surgery—and it is surgery.

But unless some cogent reasons are advanced against it, it should retain all the appearances of remedial surgery which might well restore health, vigor, and efficiency to the organs of foreign aid.

[From the Indianapolis News of May 1, 1956]

CAPEHART HAS THE RIGHT IDEA

The current Washington wave to "convert" our overseas defensive undertakings from military to economic needs some sober second thoughts.

It may be the Soviet Union's idea of throwing us off balance.

Moscow talks about reducing its armed forces. Yet the United Nations Economic Survey of Europe for 1955 discloses there was at least a 12 percent rise in Soviet military expenditures last year. In the Soviet Union there is a continuing shift toward heavy industry and armaments.

Does this look like the North Atlantic Alliance ought to become a countinghouse instead of concentrating on armaments?

We believe Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is right in opposing such a conversion.

We believe House Foreign Affairs Chairman JAMES P. RICHARDS also is right. He says that, pending some explanation from the administration where it is going with economic aid plans, he favors treating the foreign aid bill as an interim measure.

The proposed total of \$4,900,000,000 could and should be vastly reduced by eliminating not only the long-range provision, but also by confining our aid to proved friends.

Our foreign aid program needs revamping, all right, but not in the direction that some of our spenders would go.

What the United Nations needs to do is to take its overseas assistance out of the hands of the foreign politicians, instead of giving them more of it to manipulate.

Indiana Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART has introduced legislation which makes more sense than anything we have heard recently on the subject.

Senator CAPEHART urges that the bulk of foreign aid—that for military purposes—be turned over for disbursement to military agencies, instead of being spent, as presently, by civilians.

He is right in stating that "the sole purpose of these expenditures is to bolster the defenses of the United States and its allies. This can best be done by the military."

Such economic expenditures as are needed should be in the form of loans, not grants. And they should be handled by the Export-Import Bank.

Senator CAPEHART's bill would put military expenditures in the hands of the military and economic aid in the hands of businessmen—on a business basis—as he explains.

That idea has so much logic that it may be hard for some Washington do-gooders to understand. But the American people understand that kind of language. They should make themselves heard.

[From the Indianapolis Star]

A SENSIBLE PLAN

Ten years of bitter experience with foreign aid and its failures seem to indicate that if Congress had listened to Senator HOMER CAPEHART in 1946, when the Marshall plan was proposed, Americans would be \$65 billion richer and our allies would be in a sounder economic and military position than they are today.

In 1946, Senator CAPEHART proposed an alternative to the Marshall plan to give away money. He would have placed all foreign aid on a loan basis. Loans would have been made, not to governments but to individual businesses, industries, or agricultural programs. It all would have been handled by a sort of international RFC, using repayments of loans as a revolving fund to make new loans. All loans would have been made only if the possibility of repayment was there. Some repayments to the United States would have been made in strategic

materials, much of which is now going to the Soviet Union from our allies, incidentally.

Today, Senator CAPEHART again proposes a similar substitute for foreign aid. He suggests that all military aid to other nations be handled directly by the Defense Department. He proposes that all giveaway aid be stopped. And he suggests that loans to foreign countries be handled by the Export-Import Bank, which requires that all purchases of goods with such loans be made in the United States.

The Capehart substitute is far more sensible than continuance of the present giveaway program. It takes the United States State Department out of both military giving and economic aid and puts both in the hands of experts competent to handle them. It would save American taxpayers about \$4 billion a year. It would end American political interference, with foreign aid funds, in the internal affairs of our allies.

The Star believes the present foreign-aid program should be abolished. We recognize that it is in America's interest to help other people help themselves. But we believe that such aid should be put on a businesslike basis. Repayment should be expected. And money should be loaned only when there is a good possibility of a return. Under such circumstances the waste, the boondoggling, the foolish mistakes in judgment in foreign aid would be ended. This would help both the United States and our allies, because only worthwhile enterprises would be given assistance.

If the foreign-aid program is not to be completely abolished, as it should be, Senator CAPEHART's plan provides an excellent way to wind up the present program and get back to a businesslike handling of the American taxpayers' money. We suggest that all carry-over funds for foreign aid, about \$8 billion in unspent funds, be turned over in part to the military services and in part to the Export-Import Bank to carry out the Senator's plan. And we suggest that no new appropriation for foreign aid be made at all this year.

[From the Indianapolis News of May 7, 1956]
READER PRAISES CAPEHART PLAN FOR CHANNELING FOREIGN AID FUNDS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEWS:

Senator CAPEHART does have the right idea with his bill that would put our foreign-aid money into the proper hands. His plan to put military expenditures in the hands of the military and economic aid in the hands of businessmen—on a business basis of loans, not grants—is a must. It is hard to understand why this was not done long ago.

The United States cannot buy its friends and, I am sorry to say, much of our foreign aid has been watered on the leaves of these countries and has dripped into the hands of foreign politicians, with little water reaching the roots.

When I was in Korea it became obvious that even though Americans will be recorded as having the most humane armed forces in the history of mankind, we did and are still doing a poor job of winning friends. We step on many toes.

The only real, sound progress we have made has been through our missionary programs. Those people have done more to win friends and influence nations than all of our diplomats, politicians and money combined. The missionary is working at the grass-roots level, selling the very product that made America great, while our foreign-aid people try to buy our friends. The foreign-aid folks are going around with their feet off the ground and their heads up in the clouds.

No, I'm not trying to say Uncle Sam should move directly into the missionary field, but I do feel that Senator CAPEHART's bill is a step which could encourage this grass-roots feeling. It seems a shame that there is not

a missionary phase connected with our overseas forces, especially since we have troops the world over.

If we would back up all of our missionary people and correlate their programs with the military and businessmen we would actually win the ground on which we now stand. We have a much better product to sell than do the Reds with their communism, but we're not selling it.

Our freedoms made America great, and unless we keep our enterprise free, our worship free, and share it with the rest of the world, we cannot last. The United States belongs to the rest of the world the same as Indiana belongs to Ohio. This is no time to compromise with the principles that built our Nation. We must revive them and put them into use.

I will work untiringly in behalf of such a program. Will you?

THOMAS R. WARD.

AURORA.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 21, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1034) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JENNER:

Address entitled "A Constitutional Congress Can End World Government," delivered by him at Los Angeles, Calif., on June 7, 1956.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "How a Senator Promotes His State's Hotel Industry," written by him and published in the Hotel Gazette of June 9, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF RICHARD E. ROBINSON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 28, 1956, at 11:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Richard E. Robinson, of Nebraska, to be United States district judge for the district of Nebraska, vice James A. Donohoe, deceased.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and myself, chairman.

CARE OF MENTALLY ILL OF ALASKA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its dis-

agreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill in Alaska, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JACKSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. GOLDWATER conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROTEST AGAINST ICC SERVICE ORDER LIMITING RAIL CARS USE FROM GREAT LAKES PORTS—EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, an issue of the gravest importance to us of the Great Lakes States has arisen in connection with Service Order No. 914, issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This incredible and indefensible order limits to merely 2 days the free time on railroads delivering export cargo to ocean carriers at lake ports. By contrast a 6-day free-time period is authorized at all ocean and gulf ports under ICC Service Order 912.

There is no excuse whatsoever for this discrimination against Great Lakes ports. I respectfully urge reconsideration on the part of the Commission.

I may say that I have received telegrams from cities all along the lakes, as well as messages from distinguished representatives of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, including the Honorable Harry Brockel, municipal port director of Milwaukee, expressing sentiments similar to those which I am citing now.

Yesterday afternoon in Kenosha, Wis., I delivered an address spelling out the case against Service Order No. 914. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my Kenosha address be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE KENOSHA KIWANIS CLUB, JUNE 20, 1956

SENATOR WILEY PLEDGES CONTINUED EFFORT FOR WISCONSIN PROSPERITY; PROTESTS ICC ORDER STIFLING GREAT LAKES RAILROAD TRAFFIC; URGES IMMEDIATE REVISION IN DISCRIMINATORY ORDER

I should like to talk to you, my friends, today about the problem of prosperity for our country, and, in particular, for our own State.

In considering this issue, a great many phases immediately come to mind.

America's booming production

In the first place, we are, as you know, still producing goods and services at a total figure of around \$400 billion per year.

In the second place, the national income of our people is running at the almost third of a trillion dollars mark—\$330 billion.

Unemployment spotty, but irritating

Sixty-four million Americans are employed.

In our own State, the picture is far from 100 percent bright, however. Some 19,000 jobless in Wisconsin have had to draw unemployment compensation.

When unemployment occurs, even if it is just spotty and relatively small in total (as compared with the rest of the Nation), the effect, as you know, on a specific city can be very severe.

To the unemployed man himself, to his wife and children, it is small comfort to know that the rest of our country may be prosperous.

And to the local shopkeeper or auto dealer or other merchant who finds that unemployment has cut down on purchases, even a relatively small jobless figure can prove serious.

And so, my aim, as I know the aim of all thinking Wisconsinites, is to try to make sure that we have reduced unemployment to an absolute minimum.

Our aim in Kenosha

You and I know of problems which have been experienced right here in the Kenosha area.

We know that a great deal more can be and should be done to help even out employment here and to keep raising the level of employment, the level of purchasing power, the level of income of this fine, forward-moving community.

You and I know, too, that the greatest source of Kenosha's progress and prosperity will continue to be Kenosha itself—through your own efforts, your own ingenuity and co-operation.

But whatever help you need can and should be given.

Of course, it has been a pleasure for me to cooperate toward greater prosperity with a great many fine civic-minded groups here in Kenosha and throughout our State. My aim has been to help to attract more local industry, and to help expand the industry that is presently in the area.

I pledge my continued efforts along this line.

Speeding connecting channels

One of the ways by which I am, of course, doing so, is by speeding action on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway connecting channels.

You are all familiar with the fact that the first \$5 million of appropriations for these connecting channels, west of Lake Erie, is now successfully approaching the concluding stages of congressional enactment.

These connecting channels are, of course, absolutely essential for prosperity of the upper lake area. Without the connecting channels being deepened and improved, we would not have a complete 2,300-mile, 27-foot waterway. With the channels, we will fulfill the ocean-coast goal which has been our Wisconsin dream for more than 3 decades.

But speed of construction is absolutely essential.

The main seaway navigation works will open in the spring of 1959. (Just a few weeks ago, I dedicated Eisenhower lock at Massena—on which excellent progress is being made.)

But the connecting channels will not, according to present engineering plans, be ready until 1962. So we've got to cut down this 3-year time difference—this serious time lag to the greatest possible extent. We want 27-foot traffic all the way and we want it at the earliest possible date.

My protest against unfair ICC order

Now there are more battles to be fought in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway. One such phase of the battle is a new phase in which I have been engaged for the past 48 hours.

Urgent word came to me that the Interstate Commerce Commission had, under Service Order 914, effective last Thursday,

prohibited railroads serving Great Lakes ports from allowing free time in excess of merely 2 days on rail cars delivering export cargo to ocean carriers.

This order is to me absolutely indefensible. I accordingly sent a message of immediate protest to the ICC, urging its immediate reconsideration.

Let us analyze precisely the background of the order:

Under ICC Service Order 912, a period of 6 days—I repeat—6 days was allowed for free time on rail cars at every United States ocean port on all 3 seacoasts.

Why, then, the discrimination against the lake area? Don't the people on the ICC realize that the Great Lakes route, even in its present modest status, involves immensely significant commerce with the world, commerce which requires adequate interchange time—from rail to water?

I say that the ports on the Great Lakes are absolutely entitled to equal consideration with the competing gateways from the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts.

ICC—an independent body

Now, let me make it quite clear, my friends, that no one realizes more definitely than I that the Interstate Commerce Commission is an independent, quasi-judicial organization, which is entitled to come to its own judgment, as it sees fit.

It is not and must not be subservient to the legislative branch or to the executive branch.

ICC has set a prejudicial precedent

But the ICC has a responsibility of serving all United States transportation, not just a few powerful eastern railroads which tend to exert a very strong influence. The ICC has the responsibility of observing, not ignoring the facts. And there is no good reason under the sun why the ICC should not immediately reconsider its utterly absurd order—which sets, I point out, a very bad precedent insofar as future rail-to-ocean traffic from the Midwest is concerned.

I point out to you, my friends, that the railroad lines serving the west bank Lake Michigan ports of Milwaukee, Chicago, and Green Bay in April voluntarily revised their tariffs. They did so so as to provide for 7 days free time on railroad cars, carrying export freight for delivery to ocean vessels.

Prior to this time, for many years, all lake ports had been on a domestic basis of demurrage, with only 2 days free time allowed to interchange rail cars with ocean carriers.

Western railroads had voluntarily revised their tariffs to provide for 6 days free time, so as to conform to Service Order 912 of the ICC, providing for 6 days free time to conserve railroad equipment.

Rail diehards may be trying to stifle seaway

I point out to you this striking fact: On June 5, the 8 eastern railroads whose lines parallel the Great Lakes petitioned the ICC to suspend the tariffs published by the western rail lines, providing for 6 days free time at Lake Michigan ports.

I point out to you, my friends, the hard fact that these were the very same eastern railroads which unfortunately—by and large—opposed enactment of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

And it is even more regrettable that, although the main seaway battle has long been won by us—the Wiley seaway law having been signed in May 1954—apparently there may be some diehards in these railroads who are still trying to stifle St. Lawrence seaway traffic, even in its infancy.

My warning to eastern railroad influences

I want to issue a word of stern warning to eastern railroad sources, which may be trying to use their influence—in any possible way—to curb our Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway traffic.

I want to warn them that they are due for as bad a beating on this issue as they took on the St. Lawrence Seaway itself.

And it is not going to take us a fraction nearly as long as it took us the last time—to beat the opposition.

Now, what does this newest phase of the battle signify? It signifies that we of the upper Midwest still have a terrific job before us—to try to educate the rest of the Nation. Some folks elsewhere don't seem to realize that the entire economy of the Great Lakes, heart land of our country, is being revolutionized by the seaway.

They don't seem to realize that even before the seaway comes into fruition, in the spring of 1959, the Great Lakes area represents an inland empire which matches, and in many respects, surpasses anything which any other region of our country has to offer.

I don't intend to permit our Great Lakes area to be treated as a stepchild or as an orphan child. I don't intend to allow the eastern trunk line railroads or any other railroads to minimize on the slightest—our Great Lakes prosperity.

Many fine railroaders want teamwork

I want to assure this audience that I know that there are a great many thinking folks associated with the railroads, at both the management and labor end, who have long since buried the hatchet—in a friendly, peaceful way—on the seaway fight.

As a matter of fact, all during the seaway struggle, their hearts were not really in the battle against us.

They wanted to cooperate with us of the Midwest although they were pulled along by a few powerful eastern railroads. The thinking railroaders knew that Great Lakes prosperity means railroad prosperity. It means the ability of all competing transportation channels to expand.

There is more than enough room for a booming waterway and for a booming rail transportation network which feeds the waterway.

Meanwhile all America is expanding; 4,100,000 babies were born last year—representing in themselves a vast new market for America.

We of the Midwest desire no quarrel with the railroads, and certainly no quarrel with the railroad brotherhoods. I have always had a warm admiration for the railroad brotherhoods, they are as staunch, as honest, as hard-working, and respectable a real American group as there is anywhere in our Nation—in any walk of life.

The only quarrel that we have is with a relative minority of men—in powerful positions in eastern railroads, who may be determined to fight a last-ditch—delaying-type fight against us—against the Midwest on America's fourth ocean coast.

But the narrowminded diehards are not going to succeed.

I pledge my all-out efforts to assure victory for America's inland empire.

Conclusion

These, then, are but a few of the phases of the prosperity story for Wisconsin.

I want to invite every member of this audience to be in contact with me in Washington on all ways and means by which I can further help assure complete prosperity for our State.

It has been a pleasure to be with you today, and I hope that I will have another opportunity in the not too distant future.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC SIGNS AGREEMENT FOR NUCLEAR GENERATOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, while I was in my State I was pleased to note among the news stories of inter-American cooperation the encouraging word

with regard to a new forward step of technical advance in the hemisphere.

From Baltimore came word from the Glenn L. Martin Co. of its signature with the Government of the Dominican Republic of a contract for the construction of a nuclear-powered, electrical generating system.

I am sure that the carrying out of this contract will mark a most important, yes, a most historic landmark in the history of the forward surge of the peoples of the New World—their surge to an ever higher standard of living.

I know that there is profound satisfaction in this step, and I congratulate the government and the people of the Dominican Republic in this effort, the first such contract, I believe, to be signed by a Latin-American state.

I send to the desk the text of an article which appeared in last week's Wall Street Journal concerning the new generator.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLENN L. MARTIN GETS DOMINICAN REPUBLIC NUCLEAR GENERATOR ORDER

BALTIMORE.—The Government of the Dominican Republic has contracted with the Glenn L. Martin Co. for construction of a nuclear-powered, electrical generating system to meet the growing requirements of the island, according to a statement of Martin.

The contract is contingent on a bilateral agreement between the United States and the Dominican Republic before becoming effective. The proposed reactor would increase the present electrical generating capacity of the Dominican Republic to 57,000 kilowatts from 45,000.

The basic operating principle of the Martin industrial atomic reactor is a pressurized water system. Water is pumped at high pressure in a closed system (primary loop) passage through the reactor where it absorbs the heat generated by the slightly enriched uranium contained in the core. The superheated water then passes to a steam generator where it gives up its heat to a secondary system. The cooled primary loop water is then pumped back to the reactor to continue the cycle.

The secondary loop is in general a conventional steam electric power system. The dry, saturated steam supplied by the heat exchanger is expanded through high efficiency turbines which run the electric generator.

VOLUME OF AIRLINE BUSINESS AT THE WASHINGTON AIRPORT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the people of the District of Columbia and surrounding areas, including Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties, in Maryland, have of late indicated deep concern regarding the inadequacy of the National Airport at Washington, D. C.

In the June 18 issue of Life magazine there appears a chart and statistics indicating the tremendous volume of business done by the commercial airlines at the city of Washington, in comparison with the volume of business done at Los Angeles, Dallas, Chicago, Atlanta, and New York. From the statistics it appears that the city of Washington has 427 arrivals daily, every 24 hours; the city of New York has only 272; Chicago has

400, or 27 less than the city of Washington; Dallas has 203; Los Angeles has 230; and Atlanta has 148.

In the case of departures, Washington has 408; Dallas has 204; Chicago has 400; New York has 282; Atlanta has 149; and Los Angeles has 226.

I ask unanimous consent that the chart giving those statistics be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Los Angeles: 230 arrivals, 226 departures, 12,668 passengers, 75,400 pounds of mail, 411,899 pounds of baggage, 53,216 pounds of freight.

Dallas: 203 arrivals, 204 departures, 6,809 passengers, 19,200 pounds of mail, 214,100 pounds of baggage, 90,800 pounds of freight.

Chicago: 400 arrivals, 400 departures, 27,338 passengers, 76,129 pounds of mail, 715,840 pounds of baggage, 158,254 pounds of freight.

Atlanta: 148 arrivals, 149 departures, 9,958 passengers, 13,000 pounds of mail, 226,000 pounds of baggage, 8,430 pounds of freight.

Washington, D. C.: 427 arrivals, 408 departures, 22,635 passengers, 19,207 pounds of mail, 375,000 pounds of baggage, 41,967 pounds of freight.

New York: 272 arrivals, 282 departures, 18,125 passengers, 33,866 pounds of mail, 456,118 pounds of baggage, 31,274 pounds of freight.

ADDRESS BY JOHN L. LEWIS AT DEDICATION OF 10 MEMORIAL HOSPITALS ESTABLISHED BY THE UNITED MINE WORKERS

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the United Mine Workers of America, through the instrumentality of their welfare fund, have built 10 magnificent modern hospitals in West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky, to furnish medical care and healing services for the afflicted members of that great organization.

These hospitals were all dedicated in a notable ceremony held in Beckley, W. Va., on the 2d day of this month. On that occasion, the president of the United Mine Workers, the renowned John L. Lewis, delivered an inspiring address, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY JOHN L. LEWIS AT THE DEDICATION OF THE 10 MEMORIAL HOSPITALS, JUNE 2, 1956

At these exercises today there are a large number of honored guests representing industry, finance, the social sciences, the medical sciences, and others, including the Governor of the great State of West Virginia, and the Members of Congress from the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia.

In this connection I have this telegram to read from the Honorable James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, quoting: "My best wishes attend the dedication of the 10 new United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund Hospitals today. The establishment of these much needed hospitals in West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia is but another chapter in the UMW's long history of dedicated service to its members and to the communities in which they live. Sincere regards to you and to those attending today's ceremonies." Signed: James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor of the United States.

Because of the vicissitudes of the weather, and the comfort of those in attendance, our program will be curtailed to some degree and certain of the ceremonials omitted. My own remarks will necessarily be brief. These 10 hospitals being dedicated today have been made possible through the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund. That fund made certain grants-in-aid to the Memorial Hospital Association for the erection and the maintenance of these hospitals, which in every sense of the word become community hospitals. In an area of our country where improved hospital facilities were perhaps needed more than in any other similar area the United Mine Workers of America and the associated coal operators of the country, have made possible the welfare fund through joint negotiation in their industry contracts. It was perhaps 6 years of time between the conception of the fund, the negotiation of the fund, the stabilization of the fund, and its recognition by the public at large, as being a beneficial institution.

The major accomplishments of the fund have necessarily occurred in the last 6 years, since 1950. The fund officially has been in effect for the last 10 years, since May 1946.

We have present here today one of the public representatives who gave great assistance to the mineworkers of the country at a time when the Government of the United States was in doubt whether or not to permit the establishment of this fund. I refer to Mr. Arthur J. Altmeyer, who for many years administered the Federal Social Security program, and who with our own distinguished Miss Roche served on the Interdepartmental Committee of the Government which set up the Social Security System of the United States.

The mineworkers of the country owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Arthur Altmeyer, for the service he rendered in recommending to his Government that the Government execute a contract with the United Mine Workers of America which for the first time in the history of this agonized industry gave some consideration to the human element, and the right of men and their families to live, while they rendered service in the hazardous coal industry.

The establishment of this principle in the major coal industry formed a great incentive for other industries to set up similar devices for the protection of their manpower and the well-being of their employees. And recently, a Senate committee reported that the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund had beneficiaries to the amount of almost 1 percent of the total population of the United States, and that in the United States some 70 million persons were more or less beneficiaries of the various funds set up in other industries.

Security, safety of person, the health and well-being of loved ones, are the motivating factors behind this great surge of sentiment which has crystallized into this organization whose record is public as to its accomplishments.

A Senate committee recently investigated exhaustively and almost to the point of exhaustion, the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund, and in recent hearings before the Senate committee found that it was virtuous, sound, meritorious, and, hold your breath, honestly run.

I do not know that my associate trustees feel any more honest since that verdict was rendered than they did before, and I doubt if they can find any way to act more honestly. But in any event it is nice to have a certificate of character, and we have got one.

But, the services of this fund, the services of these hospitals, for the abatement of the illnesses and the agonies of those who are afflicted and distressed, can only be maintained as long as the men in this industry, on both sides of the question, investment, management, and labor, recognize the

joint obligation of all of us to care for those who meet misfortune while serving in this industry.

I think today that there is a wider recognition of that virtue; and a more clearcut and well-defined acceptance of responsibility and desire to cooperate than in any time past that I can remember in the history of our industry. The great industrial leaders of the coal industry, I feel, recognize fully the contribution to the better health and welfare of the mining population that is coming through the systematic administering of this fund which created these hospitals, and they may take satisfaction and pride in their accomplishments.

Our industry during the last 6 years has been living in rather a new era of peace when conflict was abated and when men on both sides of the industry in immediate positions of leadership were free to apply themselves to the major project of making this industry successful and making it possible to operate under our system of free enterprise, and today our Nation boasts the most efficient, the most productive, coal-mining industry in any country of the civilized world. Coal mined in greater quantity, of better quality, at a lower cost per ton than that of any civilized nation.

The efficiencies brought into the industry in recent years are responsible for the present modest price of the product at the mine heads of the country in contrast again to the conditions which exist in other mining countries. It is due to the genius of the managers of our industry, of its engineering and technical talent, and to the productivity of the American miners. It is necessary for all of us to do what we can to perpetuate that relationship and use our energy and our talent and our minds to go forward constructively in the economic and social sense rather than engage in the dissipation of that energy through internal economic warfare.

I am proud to testify to the success that has come jointly to all of those interested in the industry during the period which I mentioned. But, great achievement brings increased responsibility. And let me say to the mine workers of this country, be alert that you retain and keep for yourselves and your family that which you have achieved. Today is today and tomorrow is tomorrow, and each morrow brings its new problems and its new responsibilities. And let me charge each and every one of you that only your union can maintain this hospital in its present status and only your union can retain your welfare fund. So, protect your union and live up to your contract, and discharge your obligations under that contract, so that the operators of this country in the mines, in the various States, may have reliance upon your word, and your honor, and your good intent to live up to that obligation which you take when you make your contract.

If there are young men among us who are hasty and impulsive, and who have yet failed to achieve and acquire the wisdom that will come to them, I hope, in later years let the elders of this organization advise them and counsel them and hold them to accountability in your local unions for their wrongful actions.

The great scheme of these hospitals came after a long time in the industry. It took many, many years for the industry to achieve a position where it could underwrite and finance an erection of this character. These are memorial hospitals in memory of those men who died without hospitals, and without proper medical attention, in the hills and in the hamlets that infest this mountain country where men lived their lives and their families became destitute because there was no provision for them, when they were ground up in the wheels of the mining industry and cast aside because they were no longer competent to earn a living or to produce a ton of coal.

So these hospitals are in memory of those who suffered and died before us that we might today be more privileged and be more comfortable and be better treated, and live longer and fulfill more of the destiny of a human being.

So care for them, you men, and care for them you men who are on the operating side of the industry and let there be no return to the conditions that prevailed here in West Virginia as well as elsewhere not too long ago.

These everlasting hills which now echo the sound of my voice have been scenes of violence in the past, where the civil laws were perverted and where the rule of the lawless was permitted and encouraged by those who would stand in the way of the progress of labor. That day has gone; let it not come back.

And the price of not letting it come back is the cooperation of the investment side of the industry through its managers and the cooperation of the labor side through the union. And when I say cooperate, I mean cooperate with your contracts and your union rules.

I am sorry, there are additional things that I might say to you on this occasion, some of them historical and some of them dealing with the present, but consideration for the comfort of all requires me to terminate these proceedings very shortly.

I am now going to call for the unveiling of the several plaques which will be presented to the 10 hospitals.

Will the following representatives of the several hospitals come forward to the platform as I read their names:

From the Harlan Memorial Hospital, Mr. Robert L. Black, hospital administrator; Dr. David McLean Greeley, chief of clinical services.

From the Hazard Memorial Hospital, Mr. Larry C. Rigsby, hospital administrator; Dr. Clifford A. Best, chief of clinical services.

From the Whitesburg Memorial Hospital, Mr. Joseph J. Doney, hospital administrator; Dr. J. Huston Westover, chief of clinical services.

From the Middlesboro Memorial Hospital, Mr. Edwin L. King, hospital administrator; Dr. Warren H. Diessner, chief of clinical services.

From the Wise Memorial Hospital, Mr. Waldo R. McNutt, hospital administrator; Dr. Gerald N. Rein, chief of clinical services.

From the Williamson Memorial Medical Center, Mr. William B. Esson, hospital administrator; Dr. Gordon M. Meade, chief of clinical services.

From the McDowell Memorial Hospital, Mr. Charles D. Jenkins, hospital administrator; Dr. Cordell H. Williams, chief of clinical services.

From the Man Memorial Hospital, Mr. Andrew M. Gould, hospital administrator; Dr. Paul A. Keeney, chief of clinical services.

From the Pikeville Memorial Hospital, Mr. Harland W. Laver, hospital administrator; Dr. Charles N. Christensen, acting chief of clinical services.

From the Beckley Memorial Hospital, Mr. Steve J. Soltis, hospital administrator; Dr. Theodore S. Wilder, chief of clinical services.

Gentlemen, I am authorized by the board of trustees of the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund, and the officers of the Memorial Hospital Association to present to each of you a ceremonial and dedication plaque for your institution, on this day, under these circumstances, and under these auspices.

I might say how intensely appreciative the trustees of the welfare fund are, and the executives of the Memorial Hospital Association, for the remarkable efficiency of your several services in setting up these 10 hospitals as a going concern, now operating, fulfilling their mission in the communities where they are located. I cannot say how

much we appreciate the time, the service, the profound knowledge, the spirit of self-sacrifice which has animated all of you in encountering and disposing of the manifold and multitude of details essential to the opening of these great units.

We are appreciative of the task of the architects, of the builders, of the technical staff, the managerial staff and we dedicate these hospitals on this day entrusting to you and your successors in office all of the responsibility that goes with that presentation and with that dedication.

I can only say that I am sure that it will be in the hearts and the minds of the trustees always, that the spiritual motto that might be emblazoned above the portals of our institutions, be: "Let no soul in extremis be turned from these doors." Thank you all. Success and my compliments. I wish to shake hands with each one of you.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE DEPUTY SPEAKER OF PAKISTAN

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present to the Senate a distinguished visitor from Pakistan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it is my high honor and coveted privilege to present to the Senate at this time the Deputy Speaker of the Parliament and the leader of the Christian group of a new republic, the Republic of Pakistan.

On yesterday, a copy of the Constitution of Pakistan was delivered to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In this troubled period, when we welcome the friendship of those who share our views regarding the democratic manner of life and who share our love of personal freedom, I can say without fear of contradiction that we have no better friends than the 90 million people of Pakistan.

Today, we have with us one of the leaders of that nation, a man high in his government, a man who is the leader of the Christian group in Pakistan.

On behalf of the Democratic membership of the Senate, we welcome him, Mr. President. I only regret that our calendar schedule is such that we cannot invite him to speak here. We shall have little opportunity for the Members of the Senate to meet him personally; but at this time I take great pleasure in presenting to the Senate the Honorable Cecil E. Gibbon, of Pakistan. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, speaking on behalf of the Senators who sit on this side of the aisle, I wish to join in the remarks of the junior Senator from Virginia in welcoming our distinguished visitor from Pakistan.

As has been pointed out, our Nation has a close and friendly relationship with his great new Republic. It has been my privilege to be in his country on several occasions. I am very happy, on behalf, I know, of the entire membership of the Senate, to join in welcoming him here today. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to point out that our distinguished guest also presented a copy of the Constitution of Pakistan to the presiding officer of the Senate, and that

copy is available in the formal office of the Vice President, for Members of the Senate to observe.

In that connection, the Chair would like to point out, too, that the man who was primarily the author of the Constitution of Pakistan, and who did most of the work on it, is our distinguished visitor today. [Prolonged applause.]

ALLEGED USE BY THE ARMY OF LIVE DOMESTIC ANIMALS AS TARGETS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have just addressed to the Secretary of Defense to determine the truth or falsehood of reports that troops at Fort Sam Houston are gaining so-called battlefield experience by shooting at live domestic animals with high-powered rifles. I also ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD a dispatch from the Oregonian of June 16, by Harold Hughes, staff reporter, describing this alleged incident, and also to include a most effective and cogent letter addressed to the Portland Oregonian on June 16, 1956, by one of my constituents, Mr. Floyd Hand, of Milwaukie, Oreg.

Mr. President, the account of this alleged shocking episode at Fort Sam Houston appeared originally in the Portland Oregonian of June 16. It is both hard and disturbing for me to believe that the Army would use live domestic animals as targets for its riflemen. Could this possibly occur in our civilized country? If it has occurred, those responsible should be eternally ashamed of themselves—and, furthermore, they should be immediately disciplined. I think the Secretary of the Army should give the Congress full information on this episode as soon as possible.

There being no objection, the letters and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 20, 1956.

HON. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the issue of the Portland Oregonian for June 16, 1956, appears an interview with an Army doctor, Capt. Carolyn Taylor. In the course of that interview, telling of some of her experiences at Fort Sam Houston, appears the following passage:

"In order to give the doctors battlefield experience, the Army shot goats with high-powered rifles at Fort Houston. 'And we had to rush out, pick them up and carry them back to a first-aid station and treat their wounds,' she said, still able to give with a magic smile."

This article in the Oregonian, the paper of largest circulation in my State, is by a reliable staff reporter, Mr. Harold Hughes.

I should like to know if the United States Army is so callous and so cruel that it is experimenting with high-powered rifles on tethered, live, domestic animals. It is both difficult and disturbing for me to believe that such an episode could possibly take place.

If it did occur, those who ordered it should be eternally ashamed of themselves. Furthermore, they should be disciplined at once by their superiors. I urge you to undertake an immediate investigation to ascertain the

truth of this report of events at Fort Sam Houston, concerning the use of live domestic animals for battlefield experience with high-powered rifles.

May I hear from you as soon as possible?
Very sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

[From the Portland Oregonian of June 16, 1956]

CAPT. CAROLYN TAYLOR, PRETTY ARMY DOCTOR,
LEAVES FOR PARIS FOR OVERSEAS HOSPITAL
DUTY

(By Harold Hughes)

From a clinical standpoint, Carolyn Taylor is formed and figured like a serious candidate for a Miss America title, a condition that is much easier to diagnose than the reasons behind her having become a doctor in internal medicine and a captain in the United States Army.

The tall, 28-year-old Dr. Taylor has wanted to be a doctor since she was 3 years old, she explained before leaving her mother's home at 3315 Northeast 41st Avenue for a trip to Paris and an assignment in an Army general hospital somewhere in Europe.

"I wanted to travel and see more of the world, so I joined the Army last year," Dr. Taylor said after explaining she has already made one globe-circling trip "on my own hook."

SHE DOES NOT LIKE ODDS

She has completed studies for her American board of internal medicine examinations and needs only 2 years of practice to qualify for the top test in the medical profession.

"They're passing about 50 percent of those who try, odds I don't like," she explained.

Dr. Taylor, who is unmarried despite having had professional training in heart problems, expects to specialize in cardiac medicine when she enters private practice, either in Portland or San Francisco, after her Army hitch.

"Cardiac is the biggest killer—you don't have to worry about business," she laughed. And when she smiles or laughs it is enough to cause a dead man to jump out of bed.

MARCHING KEEPS HER BUSY

Dr. Taylor recently enlivened a Fort Knox, Ky., ward of 35 enlisted men, all of whom swore they were ill.

"They got used to a woman doctor—after a couple of weeks," was her unbelievable statement after her first tour of Army medical duty.

Dr. Taylor took her Army basic training with 400 males at Fort Sam Houston, near San Antonio, Tex. It is possible that not since the battle of the Alamo have so many soldiers in the area felt the need of medical attention of the internal variety. But they got no help from the vivacious captain.

"I was too busy marching, trying to keep in step, which is a problem when you are wearing a skirt. It was really sad."

It apparently has not occurred to the Government that an Army skirt is not made for marching. Dr. Taylor made a libelous remark about the designer of her uniform.

"All of the men were marching boom, boom in step and I was four steps behind going click, click, click, all because of a tight skirt," she explained after noting that she has long legs (she's 5 feet 10) and should have been able to keep in step.

In order to give the doctors battlefield experience, the Army shot goats with high-powered rifles at Fort Houston.

"And we had to rush out, pick them up and carry them back to a first-aid station and treat their wounds," she said, still able to give with a magic smile.

"The medical basic used to be much stiffer, but they lost too many doctors with coronaries," she declared.

Dr. Taylor, who recently stumped the experts on the TV show, What's My Line, is

something of a brain herself. She entered the University of Oregon at the age of 15.

Dr. Taylor was born in San Francisco and moved to Portland with her mother, Mrs. Ellen Gatton, "about the time I entered the university."

During her med-school days and when not struggling with anatomy, Carolyn rode at the Columbia Hunt Club. She also went to Sun Valley twice to learn to ski.

"But I am still a risk on a slope," she added.

Dr. Taylor is the first doctor in her family. She's also one of the few female doctors in the United States Army, which has only been taking female physicians since about 1951, she believes.

Dr. Taylor reported that she's not currently engaged and was properly vague about any romance interests. But after her European tour of duty, she plans to settle down, maybe marry some doctor.

"That way I could continue to practice off and on while the children are young."

The doctor plans to have maybe three children.

"It's a nice lucky number."

MILWAUKIE, OREG., June 16, 1956.

To the EDITOR OF THE OREGONIAN:

In a feature article in the June 16 Oregonian, staff writer Harold Hughes describes the field training of Army medical officers. In telling of the experiences of Dr. Carolyn Taylor, he said, "In order to give the doctors battlefield experience, the Army shot goats with high-powered rifles at Fort Houston." Miss Taylor is quoted, " * * * and we had to rush out, pick them up and carry them back to a first-aid station and treat their wounds."

I must protest such callous treatment of innocent animals. I can't see what possible training benefit either in moving litter cases or in administering battlefield first-aid can be realized by such practice. The Army and its apologists will claim that this slaughter is essential in order that medics receive proper training in saving human lives.

This is the same argument they used when goats, pigs, chickens, and other animals were used in atomic radiation exposure tests. I accepted the argument then because I felt that there was justification. Scientific data were gained that could be used in developing treatments for atomic bomb injuries.

But to shoot goats with rifles serves no constructive purpose and to deliberately wound them is an even greater example of inhumanity. Certainly a wounded animal is not going to react like an injured human. If it has any mobility left it is not going to lie supinely on a stretcher while being transported to a first-aid station. What kind of beneficial training can be realized from field dressing of wounded creatures that is applicable to the patching up of human beings?

If the Army feels that it is necessary to impress neophyte medics with the fact that battlefields are strewn with blood and guts, I suggest that they get several truckloads of offal from the nearest slaughterhouse and broadcast it on the training course. That should give the necessary touch of realism and would permit the goats to perform their normal functions of giving mohair and milk in the service of man.

Sincerely,

FLOYD HAND.

AMERICAN FARM EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have compiled some extremely interesting figures showing the comparison between American farm exports and American imports of those products normally in competition with our own products.

It should be noted that the figures, which I presently will place in the RECORD, do not include in the list of imports rubber, coffee, tea, and spices which are not competitive with American products.

These figures were compiled for the 9-month period from July 1955-March 1956.

They show that exports for that period totaled \$1,780,754,000. Imports of competitive products totaled \$483,653,000, a difference of \$1,297,101,000.

However, in that respect there is included in the imports a little more than \$200 million worth of wool. We in the United States produce only about one-third of our wool needs. So if we deduct some \$200 million of imports of wool from the \$483 million of imports, we have only about \$283 million worth of imports, as against \$1,780,754,000 in exports.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing the figures for individual products, and the total.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm exports and imports, July 1955-March 1956, 9 months only

Product	Exports	Imports in competition with American farm products
Dairy:		
1. Cheese.....	\$8,685,000	\$20,626,000
2. Milk, evaporated.....	17,815,000	
3. Milk, dry.....	17,838,000	
4. Nonfat.....	18,145,000	
Beef and veal.....	10,854,000	26,875,000
Tallow.....	77,404,000	17,239,000
Pork.....	\$13,270,000	\$78,008,000
Lard.....	58,601,000	
Grains:		
Wheat.....	298,222,000	\$7,513,000
Flour.....	66,663,000	
Barley.....	70,772,000	
Corn.....	131,735,000	
Sorghums.....	61,981,000	
Eggs: Shell.....	17,388,000	0
Soybeans.....	140,563,000	0
Oils:		
Soybean.....	38,660,000	\$53,666,000
Cotton seed.....	69,478,000	
Tobacco.....	318,244,000	58,115,000
Wool:		
United States only produces 1/3 of its needs...		112,832,000
Wool duty 17 cents per pound on 40 to 44 pounds, and 25 cents per pound over 44 (free in bond).....		94,692,000
Rice.....	62,804,000	0
Cotton.....	217,431,000	24,687,000
Fruits, canned.....	31,039,000	0
Beans, dried.....	9,323,000	
Peas, dried.....	3,174,000	0
Vegetables, canned.....	15,181,000	0
Potatoes.....	5,484,000	0
Total.....	1,780,754,000	483,653,000

1 Cattle. 2 Feeds. 3 Oils and waxes.

NOTE.—Most of our farm imports such as rubber, coffee, tea, spices, are not in competition with American farm products.

COMMENCEMENT DAY ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Tuesday, June 5, former President Herbert Hoover made a notable address at the dedication of the Herbert Hoover High School in San Francisco, Calif. The entire address, with his kindly advice to the younger generation, is worth our careful reading, but I am

asking that it be printed in the RECORD because in the middle of the address he calls attention to a very serious situation in this country today. I quote from a part of the address:

Our country is running into a famine of trained scientists and engineers. Ten years ago our universities and technical colleges graduated about 50,000 men and women into these professions. This year they will probably turn out less than 30,000. The country needs a minimum of 50,000 each year. Communist Russia claims that she graduates 85,000 into these professions annually.

There are many explanations for this national failure.

Recently, Adm. Lewis Strauss, of the Atomic Energy Commission, also called attention to this critically serious situation.

Through the National Science Foundation we have been trying to assist in developing scholarships and other kinds of aid for promising young scientists. We must have them if we are to meet the competition of Russia. This is a responsibility which I want to call to the attention of all my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Hoover's address be printed in the body of the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER AT THE DEDICATION OF THE HERBERT HOOVER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, SAN FRANCISCO, JUNE 5, 1956

No greater nor more affectionate honor can be conferred on an American than to have a public school named after him. I deeply appreciate the honor and affection that go with your action. Some people have to endow a school to get their name on it. But this is a great gift. And I doubly value your honor because while often a transient I have for 60 years bragged about San Francisco as my hometown.

My steps in education came through the public schools and a great university which was then also free. Without those generous services from my country I could never have attained a profession. And I can prove my faith in the American public school system for my two sons also trod that path in making their way to success in life.

After all these years, I have a lingering affection to my devoted teachers. And the friendships made in school have been staunch over the years. To these institutions of free men, and their able and devoted teachers, I owe an unrepayable debt.

As I here am speaking to both the elders and students, I will take on the elders first.

I do not need to say that we elders have a great responsibility for the education of all the children of America. And this magnificent building is proof that the elders in San Francisco assume these responsibilities.

It is a further monument to the devotion of California and the State educational authorities.

OUR POSSIBLE NATIONAL FAMINE IN TRAINED SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

I would like to speak for a few moments to the elders upon a critical problem in education with which our whole Nation's public schools could help.

Our country is running into a famine of trained scientists and engineers. Ten years ago our universities and technical colleges graduated about 50,000 men and women into these professions. This year they will probably turn out less than 30,000. The country needs a minimum of 50,000 each

year. Communist Russia claims that she graduates 85,000 into these professions annually.

There are many explanations for this national failure. Many of our higher institutions complain that they are not able to secure adequately trained youngsters from the public schools. To meet the entrance requirements of our universities and technical institutions, students must have a basic training in mathematics and elementary physical sciences. Adm. Hyman Rickover, who is in a position to know, states that in 1950 only 4 percent of our high schools teach physics, 7 percent chemistry, and 13 percent geometry. They do a little better in algebra, but that figure is only 27 percent.

There are other causes of our national failure and the blame does not all rest upon our public schools. I realize that our high schools must graduate over 1,200,000 youngsters every year; that they must look at the needs of the whole 1,200,000 more than preparation for only the 50,000 scientists and engineers. I realize the difficulty of the public schools in securing teachers in science. I realize also that the cost of training in these professions in our universities and colleges has risen above the resources of many parents and many youngsters. Not every youngster wishes, or is adapted, to enter these professions. But it is a pity that those who are adapted, any of them, find their public schools have failed in their preparation.

To finish this scolding, I say at once that none of this assault is directed to this school. But somebody must be a public school.

I suggest that unless somebody attends to this job, many of the wheels in the United States will someday stop going around.

To the youngsters I, as an engineer, would suggest that there are no professions of greater satisfactions. The engineer has the fascination of watching a figment of imagination emerge into a plan on paper. Then it moves to realization in cement, in metal, or energy. Then it brings new jobs and better homes. And I might add that on the average it is the highest paid profession in the country—and there are today five bids to a job for every graduate.

THE YOUNGSTERS

I can turn from scolding elders to a much more cheerful subject. That is, the chattering, fun-loving, ambitious youngsters in this school. Even to look at them is a relief from thinking about national problems.

And I can say something to youngsters which perhaps they will appreciate more in a few years.

Somebody will tell you of the failures of our Government—and it is often justified. No government is perfect because human beings are not perfect. But I may remind such persons that despite many disheartening things, under our American system of government we have given more opportunities to every boy and girl than any other government on earth.

Somebody will tell you that the older generations have made a mess of things which must be reformed. I have often agreed with that idea. But you should remember that it was the older generations who built all these schools, these libraries, these playing fields, these homes, these farms, these factories, these stores, these radios, and orchestras, with all these ways of earning a living and enjoying life. Someday all these elders are going to die. Someday you will inherit all these things and the jobs of managing them. And do not forget, it was the older generation who gave you the greatest heritage that can come to man—national independence and personal liberty.

Someday you will be the older generation. As the new older generation, you can undertake to reform our national ways—and they will need it.

And finally I would like to assure you that you need have no fears of your future.

Do not think it is a cold, hard world you are going into. You will find a kindness and helpfulness from your elders as you venture into your callings in life. Your elders want you to succeed.

From the astonishing advances in science and technology, you will enter into a world of constantly new frontiers, new opportunities, and new adventures, besides managing your inheritance.

Many of you will become great leaders, great artists, great baseball players and, I hope, great engineers. But more important than becoming great is the everyday toll and the satisfaction of carrying on our American way of life.

And again I express my gratitude for your affectionate honor.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRANSIT SITUATION

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I should like to report briefly to the Senate on the latest developments in the District of Columbia transit situation.

The conference committee on S. 3073, of which committee I am chairman, met on May 28 and requested the District Commissioners to meet with any private groups in an effort to work out a firm proposal which would be acceptable to the Commissioners.

Several groups subsequently made proposals to the Commissioners and lengthy discussions followed.

Today, I am in receipt of a report signed by Robert E. McLaughlin, president of the Board of Commissioners, in which he presents a lengthy and detailed discussion of their activities.

This is not the time or place to go into this report, but in essence, the Commissioners have received no proposal that is acceptable to them.

I am encouraged, however, by the number of private groups that have presented proposals, and I am hopeful that one of them—or some new group—may yet be able to reach a satisfactory agreement with the Commissioners.

I understand that all members of the conference committee now have copies of this report. It is my thought that, after they have had an opportunity to study it, the committee should meet again, probably next week.

I should like to say that I am impressed by the way the Commissioners have tackled this problem, and what appears to be their strong desire to find a private operator for the transit system if it is at all possible. I know they must have the best interests of the Washington public and the District government in mind.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that two editorials from the Washington Post and Times Herald on the transit matter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 20, 1956]

HOLD FAST TO REGULATION

The District Commissioners are under strong pressure to work out a deal with one or another of the groups seeking to take over the Capital Transit Co. Congress has

demonstrated an unmistakable coolness toward the creation of a public transit authority here. Likewise, the community appears to favor private transit operation if satisfactory arrangements can be made. In short, the tide is running powerfully toward continuation of the CTC under new management.

The Commissioners are under pressure from another source. Less than 2 months remain of the year that Congress gave them to work out a solution of the city's transit problem. On August 14 the franchise of the Capital Transit Co. will expire, and Washington will be in difficult straits unless some means of transporting more than 250,000 patrons daily has been devised. In this kind of situation the Commissioners are not free to wait an ideal setup. They must send their recommendations to Capitol Hill without delay, and Congress must act fast to avert an emergency.

While recognizing these facts, however, it is also well to remember that the decision about to be made may vitally affect the welfare of the Capital City and its inhabitants for many years to come. In the long run the action of the Commissioners will be judged by the kind of transit system that results from it and not merely by the avoidance of an emergency 2 months hence. To our way of thinking, therefore, it is more important to adhere to sound principles than to make a quick deal that the community would forever thereafter regret.

Fortunately, the Commissioners are well aware of the pitfalls in some of the policies that are being urged upon them. They appear to be adamant, for example, in their resistance to the proposal of the National City Lines, Inc., which has a conditional contract to buy Capital Transit, that the company be relieved from its obligation to finance the cost of repaving the streets when the streetcar tracks are removed. Nor are the Commissioners willing to concede that National City earnings should be 10 percent of gross operating revenue after all expenses, taxes, license fees, and interest have been paid. Similarly they have resisted the suggestions of the Fox-Chalk group that the company's rate base and a right to earn a 6½ percent return on that investment be written into the law.

The first requisite, in our opinion, is that the new transit system shall be adequately regulated in the public interest. Any agreement or deal which left the public unprotected might prove to be a frightful boomerang. Congress, no less than the Commissioners, must be on guard against a let-down of regulatory standards, for what is done here will have repercussions throughout the country. Congressmen will not want to get themselves into the position of compromising on so important an issue.

The only safe course, therefore, is to cling to sound regulatory principles, and the Commissioners are to be commended for adhering to that course. We think that a well-managed private transit company can operate successfully here with strict regulation if the Public Utilities Commission speeds up its operations. If no private firm is willing to assume the risks of operating under standard regulation, it would be better to face the problems of public operation immediately than to leave regulation in the hands of Congress or the utility itself. The first obligation of the Commissioners is to see that the public interest is protected in regard to future ratemaking as well as continuation of transit service.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 21, 1956]

LET D. C. DO IT

The effort to write legislation that would put a new private transit operator into busi-

ness in Washington before next August 14 appears to have broken down. The District Commissioners made herculean efforts to carry out the wishes of the House-Senate conferees in this regard, but they have not been able to come up with any agreement that could be promptly translated into a new transit franchise. The stubborn facts that stand out are that the National City Lines has signed a conditional contract to buy the assets of the Capital Transit Co. and that the proposition the NCL has made to the Commissioners is wholly unacceptable. No other potential successor to Capital Transit can be given a charter while Congress is still in session unless this deal should be quickly abandoned and satisfactory terms could be worked out.

In these circumstances Congress has the alternative of accepting the Capital Transit-NCL deal, against the advice of the Commissioners, or of giving the Commissioners authority to work out a solution after Congress has adjourned. To our way of thinking, the first alternative would be disastrous. It would inflict heavy losses upon the community by relieving the successor company of the obligation to repave the streets after streetcar tracks are removed. It would make a shambles of transit regulation. It is unthinkable that Congress should impose such penalties upon the city for the sake of keeping transit operation in private hands.

If Congress gives the Commissioners authority to work out a solution, there is a strong probability that they will be able to come to agreement with the Chalk-Fox group, the McDonald group, or some other potential private operator. Under the Senate bill, the Commissioners could grant such operator a franchise which could later be confirmed by specific congressional action. The Commissioners' recommendations to the conferees are said to take this approach, and we do not see how responsible officials who give first thought to the welfare of the community can reject such an appeal.

Of course it will be necessary, if Congress follows this line of thinking, to authorize the Commissioners, as a last-ditch safeguard to take by eminent domain whatever part of Capital Transit's assets may be needed to continue a satisfactory transit system here. Otherwise the city might be left without mass transportation once more with no means of doing anything about it. Congress is reluctant to take this step, but it is certainly less objectionable than any other course now open to it. If all efforts to secure good transit service through private operators break down, public operation becomes an unavoidable obligation. The time has come to face this fact and let the District authorities work out the best solution possible.

DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, one of the problems which has concerned many citizens of my State and other States has been that of discrimination in housing.

From time to time, I have brought this matter to the attention of the Honorable Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and he has written me a letter outlining in considerable detail the steps taken to achieve the objective of assuring to all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color, equal rights and equal opportunities under the housing programs administered by that agency.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Cole's letter printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C.

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: This is in response to your letter of March 15 to Bill Painter requesting comments on letters you have received from Mrs. Frances Levenson, executive director of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, and from Mr. Hyman Haves, of the same organization.

Mrs. Levenson's assertions that racial segregation continues in housing built under the Federal housing programs and that the Federal Government is actually supporting the spread of segregation are, of course, familiar to me. We have had various meetings with the National Committee Against Discrimination and other organizations concerned with the elimination of racial discrimination. I am in complete sympathy with this objective. I have expressed many times my deep conviction that all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color, should have equal rights and equal opportunities. As Housing Administrator, the prime objective of my efforts is the realization of a good home in a decent neighborhood for all Americans.

Our efforts in this direction have been vigorous, continuing, and, I believe, productive. In 1954, I conducted a conference on housing for minority groups—the first of its kind—at which representatives of industry, finance, government, churches, and minority organizations exchanged their views and proposals, in an atmosphere of full freedom of expression. In speeches, conferences, interviews, and the day-to-day conduct of business, the Commissioners of HHFA's constituent administrations and I have worked to arouse leaders of the private building and financing industry to their obligations and their opportunities in the minority group market. In July 1954, for example, the FHA Commissioner notified the National Association of Home Builders of his intention to reinforce FHA support of housing for minorities (with special emphasis on the development of demonstration open occupancy projects in suitable key areas), and outlined his specific plans for doing so. In March 1955, he gave his operating personnel an emphatic directive on the subject, and has followed it up.

I want to emphasize that the leaders of the building and lending industries, with whom we are in constant contact in the course of day-to-day operations, have reacted cooperatively and energetically to our continuous emphasis on housing for minority group families, and they are giving special and substantial effort to its production. The National Association of Home Builders has established national and regional committees to stimulate its membership to provide minority group housing, and has distributed a "minority housing kit" with a packaged program and agenda for local meetings. The Mortgage Bankers Association has taken similar action, and FHA personnel have assisted both associations in these undertakings and have contributed to their trade publications. I am convinced that the efforts of these leaders on a national scale are being reflected locally in an increasingly substantial volume of production of housing for these families.

Through January 1956, the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit program had placed a total of 12,000 loans. Of these loans, nearly 1,800 were for housing units specifically available to members of minority groups. The extent to which the remaining 10,200 were for minority housing is unknown. In

view of the newness of this program these figures are outstanding.

The Public Housing Administration's policy is that programs must reflect equitable provision for eligible families of all races determined on the approximate volume and urgency of their respective needs, and that additional public housing for white families will not be assisted in communities which are found to be neglecting the needs of their racial minorities. Under the Housing Act of 1954, the small program authorized was based entirely upon the needs of families displaced by slum clearance and other governmental action. In allocating the units authorized by the 1955 amendments to localities, priority was administratively established for cities with relocation needs and cities needing the housing to provide a greater degree of racial equity in the housing supply for low income families. In all public housing first preference for occupancy goes to families displaced from slum housing. Since racial minorities constitute a high proportion of slum dwellers, these circumstances orient the low-rent program significantly to serve their needs. While the selection of tenants and assignment of dwelling units are primarily matters for local determination, local housing authorities are encouraged to admit tenants without regard to racial considerations. In 1953 PHA published a bulletin on the subject for the guidance of interested local authorities.

The Urban Renewal Administration has strengthened the requirements it imposes on local public agencies for relocating displaced slum families in decent housing. These agencies are required to maintain family relocation services to find housing for the displaced families, but many families relocate themselves without using the service. So far as possible such families have been traced in order to make certain that they are housed in standard units. During the last 2 years new procedures have reduced the percentage of families which cannot be traced from 25 percent of total families moved from project sites (March 1954) to 15 percent (September 1955). Furthermore, the agencies are now required not only to trace the families but to inspect accommodations procured by them, to classify the units as standard or substandard, and, in the case of the substandard ones, to continue their referral service to the families and make every effort to get them into decent housing. More than half of the 4,700 units of housing for relocation for which private financing has been authorized under section 221 of the National Housing Act are intended for minority group occupancy.

All contracts and instruments for sale or lease of land cleared under the urban renewal program prohibit the execution of instruments restricting the sale, lease, or occupancy of the land upon the basis of race.

As I understand their position, the National Committee Against Discrimination would have the Federal Government set up, as a condition to all types of Federal assistance in housing, a rigid agreement that the recipients of this aid agree to eliminate racial segregation and to require integration. For a number of reasons, I do not believe that so drastic a step is possible or desirable at this time.

In the FHA program, which is designed to stimulate privately built and privately financed housing, such a requirement would be extremely difficult to enforce. To the extent that it were possible to put teeth into such a requirement I am convinced that the result, in many parts of the country, would be a sharp cutback in the rate of housing production, and of our capacity to meet the housing needs of all the people. Such drastic action would set us back in the accomplishment of our goal of decent housing for all and produce a severe impact upon our economy as well.

In the case of public-housing projects, which are locally planned and controlled, a federally imposed requirement for racial integration would certainly result in the rejection of this form of Federal aid by many communities where the need for low-rent housing, especially for minority group families, is most pressing.

All of the programs administered by this agency rely basically upon private and local initiative and place heavy reliance upon local responsibility in meeting housing needs. The role of the Federal Government in the housing programs is to assist, to stimulate, to lead, and sometimes to prod, but never to dictate or coerce, and never to stifle the proper exercise of private and local responsibility. This is as it should be, not only because housing needs and problems are peculiarly local but also because undue Federal intervention is incompatible with our ideas of political and economic freedom.

I am sure I do not need to remind you that the problems of racial discrimination are also peculiarly local. In addition, they are complex and deeply rooted in local traditions, institutions, and emotions. Here, as in other facets of the housing problem, I believe we should rely heavily on local responsibility and local wisdom to work out solutions, with appropriate assistance, stimulation, and leadership from the Federal Government.

These principles have guided the vigorous steps against racial discrimination in housing which we have taken during the past 3 years. I believe we have made significant progress. However, we are by no means satisfied. Much more must be done, as circumstances develop and opportunities can be seized, by the Federal Government, by local government, by private groups, and individual citizens. I assure you that we are continually assessing our own efforts and seeking to find new and better ways of discharging Federal responsibility for the elimination of racial discrimination in housing.

Because the President expressed so well at a recent press conference the policy we are trying to follow in the Housing Agency, I should like to quote some of his words about the current process of school integration: "So, let us remember that there are people who are ready to approach this thing with moderation, but with a determination to make progress that the Supreme Court asked for. If ever there was a time when we must be patient without being complacent, when we must be understanding of other people's deep emotions, as well as our own, this is it. Extremists on neither side are going to help this situation, and we can only believe that the good sense, the commonsense, of Americans will bring this thing along, and the length of time I am not even going to talk about."

I appreciate very much the opportunity you have given me to comment on this very important question. The letters from Mrs. Levenson and Mr. Hayes are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

AL COLE, Administrator.

AGREEMENT BY COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE ON FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the conferees on the highway bill have today concluded their labors. In that connection I have issued a statement, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

The conference agreement on the biggest highway construction program ever to be

undertaken by the American people represents a great improvement over the bill passed by the Senate. This is especially noticeable in its apportionment of funds for the national system of interstate and defense highways and in its recognition of the problems involved in integrating toll roads, bridges, and tunnels into the system.

A major victory was won by acceptance of the principle that no State should receive less, nor more, than the Federal Government's 90-percent share of the cost of completing the Interstate System within that State's borders. At the end of the 13-year construction period, under the agreement, each State will have its portion of the Interstate System completed and will have received from the Federal Government 90 percent of the cost.

One effect of the decision to use the Senate bill's apportionment formula for the first 3 years, and the House bill's cost basis for the remaining 10 may be to delay construction in some States during the early years of the 13-year program. To offset this, the conference accepted my amendment which provides, in effect, that a State may use funds of its own on additional interstate projects in the years when the Senate formula is operative, and be reimbursed for the Federal Government's 90-percent share of the cost of such projects from its apportionments in later years.

Although the conference agreement deletes the House bill's declaration of intent to reimburse States which already have built acceptable highways, free or toll, on Interstate System routes, it paves the way for such reimbursement in later years by providing a study to obtain essential information now lacking. Moreover, it provides for the use of Federal-aid funds on approaches to toll projects, clarifying and expanding existing law.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that it is the plan of the leadership to program for consideration tomorrow Calendar No. 2259, H. R. 9852, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950. The expiration date on that legislation is June 30.

We had planned to program that bill earlier in the week, but it was necessary for some of our colleagues to be out of town, to attend State conventions and for other purposes, and we have held that bill over in an attempt to accommodate them. In accommodating them we may now inconvenience other Senators. However, we have the Defense Department appropriation bill set for consideration, and then the foreign aid authorization bill and the foreign aid appropriation bill must come along. We hope to finish those by June 30. Therefore, if we are to have H. R. 9852, the Defense Production Act, acted on, it is necessary for us to consider it tomorrow or at the earliest possible date.

I should like to inform the Senate also that from here on it will probably be necessary to hold Friday, and, perhaps, some Saturday sessions.

We do not expect the Senate to be in session on July 4, which falls on a Wednesday, but we do expect to hold sessions on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday, and on Saturday, if necessary, to dispose of the program ahead of us.

I should also like to have the Senate be on notice that the leadership has cleared for consideration on tomorrow, in addition to Calendar No. 2259, H. R. 9852, the Defense Production Act, the following measures:

Calendar No. 2220, S. 2654, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.;

Calendar No. 2253, S. 3467, to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States;

Calendar No. 2293, S. 3512, to permit desert land entries on disconnected tracts of land which in the case of any one entryman form a compact unit and do not exceed in the aggregate 320 acres;

Calendar No. 2294, S. 3042, to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, in order to promote the development of phosphate in the public domain; and

Calendar No. 2299, H. R. 5256, to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps.

In addition, we hope to have for early consideration by the Senate the conference report on the road bill. I wish to congratulate the group of conferees who have completed the conference report on that bill for doing a very fine job in a very thorough manner.

The conferees on the public works appropriation bill may be ready to report. Any Member interested in either of those bills should be on notice that the conference reports on them may be called up tomorrow, in the event the House shall have acted; if not, then at the earliest possible date.

Now that the month of July is close upon us, I hope every Senator will make plans to be available in the Senate for a full week.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I did not quite understand the Senator's conclusion with reference to the defense-production bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I stated that the leadership planned to proceed to the consideration of that bill tomorrow, and I hope we can dispose of it tomorrow. Its consideration was postponed in order to accommodate some of our colleagues. It may inconvenience some other colleagues to have the bill considered tomorrow, but we had very little choice in the matter.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has morning business been closed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business has not been closed.

NEW USES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, again I should like to invite the attention of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to the fact that I hope, as do 6 million American farmers, that the committee will hold hearings and report favorably on the bill introduced by me, together with thirty-odd other Senators, to establish laboratories and pilot plants to find new uses for farm products. I again urge the committee to hold hearings on the bill. In my opinion, we should do something worth while, something that would be permanent, for the American farmers before the end of the second session of this Congress.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1957

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986), an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Goldwater	Millikin
Allott	Gore	Monroney
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Barrett	Hennings	Mundt
Beall	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bender	Hill	Neely
Bricker	Holland	Neuberger
Bridges	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Bush	Humphrey	Pastore
Butler	Jackson	Payne
Byrd	Jenner	Potter
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Clements	Knowland	Scott
Cotton	Kuchel	Smathers
Curtis	Laird	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Sparkman
Duff	Long	Stennis
Dworshak	Magnuson	Symington
Eastland	Malone	Thye
Ellender	Mansfield	Watkins
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Frear	McCarthy	Wofford
Fulbright	McClellan	Young
George	McNamara	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). A quorum is present.

BANK MERGERS IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a letter which was sent to me under date of May 28, 1956, by the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, transmitting a statement with respect to the merger of certain banks in the State of New York which he requested me to have printed in the record of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

It would appear, according to the testimony of Mr. CELLER given several days ago, that the bank authorities of the State of New York had denied permission to State banks to merge. Another merger, however, was accomplished a short time later between one of the banks against which the State banking department had ruled and a national bank, thus taking that merger out of the jurisdiction of the State banking authorities.

The facts, as developed by Representative CELLER are of such great importance that I think Mr. CELLER's letter should be printed in the body of the RECORD and referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which is presently interested in the matter.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the letter and also the text of the statement by Representative CELLER.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, May 28, 1956.

Hon. JOSEPH O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Antitrust Subcommittee,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: Enclosed please find the history of a very bad situation in New York, where the Comptroller of the Currency Gidney deliberately flouted the policy of the State superintendent of banks, Mr. George Mooney, and paid no heed to competitive banking situations.

I would indeed appreciate it if you would make this letter and the enclosed factual background a part of the hearings on H. R. 9424.

Thanking you and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MANNY.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND REGARDING MERGER OF SECOND NATIONAL BANK OF COOPERSTOWN INTO NATIONAL COMMERCIAL BANK AND TRUST COMPANY OF ALBANY

Late last fall the Banking Department of New York State was approached by the State Bank of Albany for its reaction to their intention to merge with the Second National Bank of Cooperstown. Cooperstown is a small town, not far from Albany. At that time, there were in Cooperstown two national banks of about the same size, the First National Bank and the Second National Bank.

The New York Banking Department, after determining that conditions in Cooperstown were very similar to those in Auburn, N. Y., where a proposed merger had recently been disapproved, alerted the State Bank of Albany people to the fact that approval of their proposed merger might not be forthcoming.

The New York State Banking Department felt indeed that this merger would be contrary to the principles of the Celler-Kefauver-O'Mahoney Act, amendatory of section 7 of the Clayton Act.

Mr. Mooney, New York State superintendent of banks had appeared before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopoly while I was presiding and unequivocally stated that he would approve no mergers if the effect might be a substantial lessening of competition in a given area. We called this principle that was to guide him the "Auburn" principle because he first followed it in the proposed Auburn case.

With respect to the prior situation in Auburn, the Auburn Trust Co. had been acquired by the Marine Midland Corp., which wished to merge into its Syracuse unit, the Marine Midland Company of Central New York.

There was also in Auburn the National Bank of Auburn which was about the same size as the Auburn Trust Co. Superintendent Mooney took the position that the proposed merger in Auburn would place the remaining independent bank, a national bank by the way, at a competitive disadvantage.

Although it would compete on even terms with Auburn Trust Co., it would not be expected to do so if the trust company became part of the much larger Marine Midland Trust Company of Central New York.

After the above factual situation was outlined to representatives of the State Bank of Albany, they were told that Superintendent Mooney, following the Auburn principle, was disposed to disapprove the plan to merge the Second National Bank of Cooperstown into the State Bank of Albany. When this decision was made known to the directors of the State Bank of Albany, they withdrew their informal request for approval of the merger.

However, at this time the State Bank of Albany pointed out to the department that it was fearful that its competitor in Albany, the National Commercial Bank, would attempt to merge the Second National Bank of Cooperstown.

When these fears were expressed to the superintendent, he informed the State bank people that he had conferred with the Comptroller of the Currency Gidney on merger problems generally at the time of his disapproval of the proposed Auburn merger as outlined above. The banking department was told by the comptroller at that time that he agreed with the policy set by it in the Auburn decision.

When this was outlined to the State bank people, the department assured them that it would immediately protest to the comptroller of the currency any attempt by the National Commercial Bank to merge the Second National Bank of Cooperstown, and it felt sure, based on its prior conversations, that its protests would be given due weight.

Shortly thereafter the State bank people again approached the department to tell it that it was reported that the National Commercial Bank of Albany had applied to the comptroller of the currency for permission to merge the Second National Bank of Cooperstown.

Superintendent Mooney immediately arranged for a conference with the Comptroller of the Currency Gidney, so that his objections to the proposed merger might be set forth.

At the conference with the comptroller, Mr. Mooney pointed out that the National Commercial Bank of Albany sought to do exactly what the State Bank of Albany had been discouraged from doing.

He expressed the strong conviction that the comptroller should deny the application for the same reasons that Mr. Mooney himself had discouraged the earlier application.

Approval of the application, he said, was undesirable because of the substantial lessening of competition which would inevitably result in Cooperstown. In addition, approval of the merger, Mr. Mooney added, would also result in a second merger or the liquidation of the remaining bank, namely the First National Bank at Cooperstown.

At this point both Mr. Gidney and his assistant, Mr. Jennings, stated that they had never gone along with the banking department on its thinking in the Auburn situation.

This was absolute repudiation of the so-called Auburn principle, but also was a denial of a solemn assurance that Mr. Gidney gave to the House Antitrust Subcommittee.

He stated before the committee that he would not approve any national bank merger where the effect might be to substantially lessen competition. Messrs. Gidney and Jenkins stated that it would be difficult for them to deny a merger merely because it might place another independent bank in an inferior competitive position.

They stated that there had been too many such instances all over the country for the comptroller to take such a position at this late date. Mr. Jennings was frank to say that had he been in the superintendent's place he would have approved the Auburn and Cooperstown mergers.

At the close of the conference Mr. Gidney stated he appreciated the position of the superintendent and would give the problem more thought. Approximately 1 week later the following letter was received from the Comptroller of the Currency:

"We have given very careful consideration to the facts presented by you during our conversation of April 6, 1956, with respect to the proposed merger of the National Commercial Bank & Trust Co., Albany, N. Y., with the Second National Bank, Cooperstown, N. Y. We have every desire to cooperate with you, and we are most reluctant to take any action which does not meet with your agreement. However, the facts as they exist, and as we evaluate them, do not permit us to refuse to approve the proposed merger which meets all the requirements of the Federal statutes. Both from a legal and moral standpoint, we cannot act arbitrarily or capriciously in making such decisions, and as we are not aware of any sound reasons to deny this merger application, we are required to give it our approval."

Effective as of the close of business May 18, 1956, the Second National Bank of Cooperstown was merged into the National Commercial Bank of Albany.

This was all consummated with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency and thereafter the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation likewise rubber-stamped the approval.

Attached you will also find a draft of an agreement entered into by what is known as an Interagency Committee, which is composed of representatives of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Reserve Board.

The National Association of Supervisors of State Banks is composed of the 48 State banking supervisors, plus the banking supervisor of Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii.

Over a year ago, this interagency committee agreed to set up liaison between the Federal and State supervisory agencies, so that there could be proper coordination between Federal and State banking authorities. It was agreed that there would be set up definite standards for guidance to the end that there would not be any undue concentration of banking facilities resulting from mergers. One whole year had elapsed and the Federal agencies aforesaid have taken no action.

The enclosed is a draft of a letter dated early in April 1956 which was sent to repre-

sentatives of the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency.

It clearly indicates dereliction and refusal on the part of these agencies to cooperate with the State banking supervisors.

Now comes Comptroller of the Currency Gidney and, in common parlance, literally thumbs his nose at the New York State banking superintendent and does exactly what the New York State superintendent refused to do because of serious competitive implications.

It is almost fantastic. The moral of this situation is that we cannot trust the Comptroller of the Currency to do the needful in the face of the present merger movement.

The Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Reserve Board have appealed to your committee that the matter of mergers should be left entirely to them.

The above is a case history of what would happen if these entities were given the sole authority.

The above is also the best evidence I can submit to demonstrate the necessity for giving the Department of Justice the responsibility for enforcement.

"DEAR ——. At the recent meeting of the executive committee of this association in Washington there was a great deal of discussion of pending merger legislation in Congress and of the merger problem generally. As it had been our understanding that the Interagency Committee was to attempt to agree on a joint approach to merger applications and legislative proposals, we were disappointed to learn from our representative on that committee that this objective had not been reached.

"The executive committee has instructed me to seek from each of the Federal supervisory agencies a statement of the policies which guide it in considering such merger proposals as come within its province. We should also be interested in learning whether an analysis has been made of the types of mergers which have been approved or disapproved over the past 5 or 10 years. What percentage were motivated for instance, by aging board and management, desire to acquire another institution because of good executive material, an effort to meet competition caused by mergers of rival institutions, or salvage operations where merger was the alternative to involuntary liquidation, etc.? We would also like to learn your views as to when and under what circumstances you feel that mergers might merit disapproval because they raise serious questions of concentration.

"It seems to us that loss of control over mergers can only be avoided by the Federal and State bank supervisory agencies if we present a united front, and, by exchange of ideas on policies, and data on practices, reach a common ground upon which we can present a sound, well-thought out program, satisfactory to Congress and the general public.

"My associates and I await your early reply so that our own deliberations may be guided accordingly.

"Sincerely,

"Chairman, Executive Committee."

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY JAPANESE TRADE UNION LEADERS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in the diplomatic gallery, as guests of the Senate today, are a number of trade union leaders from Japan. They are visiting the United States on a productivity tour and plan to visit various places in our country. They are firm believers in establishing closer trade relations between the United States and Japan.

It is a privilege to have them visit the Senate today. I shall ask them to stand so that the Members of the Senate may greet them.

The distinguished visitors rose from their places in the gallery and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. I wish to report on an incident which took place in my office yesterday and which, I believe, is of great significance to the Senate and the entire country.

Yesterday, in the morning, three men barged into my office, brushed my secretary—my receptionist—aside, and said they wished to inspect a certain part of my office. They at first showed no credentials. They showed their credentials only when she insisted on seeing them. One of those men, as I shall again report later, was a member of the Capitol Police. Two of these men came from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

This morning the New York Times carried a page-one story of the incident. The press services and many newspapers carried a similar story based on the account in the Times. The New York Times story, which I am about to read, and which received such prominence in this morning's edition of the Times, is a fairly accurate report, within the limits of the resources for accuracy available to the reporter.

Mr. President, I do not know who tipped off the Times to the story, I certainly did not. But somebody must have given him the story. I shall read now the article which appeared on page one of the Times this morning. The headline reads: "Agents Hunt A 'Bug' in LEHMAN'S Office." The article, which is dated Washington, June 20, reads:

Two men with badges walked into Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S office today and scrutinized his refrigerator closet.

Security being what it is, no one can be certain what they were looking for, but circumstantial evidence suggests they suspected a "bug," an electrical or electronic device used for long-range eavesdropping.

The Senator's closet is adjacent to a Senate hearing room where hypersecret Defense Department information is being submitted to an Armed Services Subcommittee investigating the Nation's aerial preparedness for war.

The subcommittee revealed yesterday that security police were guarding the air around the room against potential devices for eavesdropping.

The agents' job, according to the subcommittee, is to insure that no remotely controlled clandestine transmitters are put into operation during a conference.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, who conducts the hearings, said that though the check was merely a routine precautionary measure, similar procedure had never been used before in Senate hearings.

The Defense Department refused today to describe its techniques for fighting any long-range snoopers. Radio monitoring and visual inspection are vaguely alluded to, but more precise information is secret.

The guessing in Senator LEHMAN'S office today was that it had been subjected to the visual inspection technique. Miss Mildred Akins, one of the New York Democrat's

secretaries, said she was startled to notice a Capitol policeman and two men in civilian clothes prowling resolutely through private quarters of the office.

"I said, 'Nobody comes in our office unless I see a badge or something,'" she reported. The policeman, she said, muttered something about security and a hearing next door. The other two men flashed badges.

Thereupon, she said, they sought out the closet where the staff keeps a small refrigerator and scanned it professionally. They left without further explanation.

Normally congressional hearing rooms are checked for eavesdropping devices before sessions in which secret information is to be divulged. The continuous check with radio monitoring devices, however, is thought to be an innovation. It is operated by the security office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Miss Akins said that the two men who checked Senator LEHMAN'S office today seemed satisfied that nothing sinister was secreted there and left after simply looking.

The Capitol office buildings, however, rank among the worst security nightmares of Washington for the Defense Department. There is no restraint or check on the public. Crackpots appear in high percentage to plead all manner of causes and the corridors are usually thronged with mobs of tourists.

The police force, which in theory guards it, is a special group recruited from men seeking minor political patronage and bears little resemblance to any other police force in the Nation. It is utterly political and has no connection with the professional Washington city force.

I shall not read the rest of the article. I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In hearings last year a private detective specializing in wiretapping told a House committee that new eavesdropping devices being developed would enable a snooper to stand outside a building and "bug" any hearing room.

This, he testified, could be done electronically.

The Defense Department's reference to "radio monitoring" as an "antibug" device presumably means that the Department is now equipped to detect such snoopers.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I believe that neither the incident nor the inspection of my office reflected on me personally. That, however, is not the question, Mr. President. What happened yesterday, in my opinion, was inexcusable, outrageous, and highly dangerous; and I protest against it with all the force at my command. I believe that the incident which happened yesterday affects the dignity and the independence of the Senate of the United States.

Yesterday, as I have said, three men barged into my office. One was a member of the Capitol Police force. The other two men were from the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Neither of those two Departments or agents have any power whatsoever except those granted them by the Congress of the United States. When they came, they immediately busied themselves with their paraphernalia in that portion of my office in which, as Miss Akins has said, the office refrigerator is located, and which, I may add, is used as a store-

room and working space for my two office messengers.

Mr. President, as I recall, I have occupied that office ever since I came to the Senate, 7 years ago, and no question has ever been raised regarding the security of the office or regarding anything connected with security in my office.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—
Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, before yielding, I should like to complete my statement, if I may.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.
Mr. LEHMAN. Then I shall be very glad, indeed, to yield.

Mr. President, these men did not even show their credentials, except upon the insistent demand of Miss Akins, one of my secretaries; and then they merely flashed their credentials, and neither explained nor justified their conduct.

Mr. President, the men never communicated with me. They never asked my permission to inspect my office; and Mr. President, that failure to communicate with me or to obtain my permission is in spite of the fact that I was either in my office or on the floor of the Senate or in committee meeting, constantly available to anybody, from about 9 o'clock in the morning until after 6 o'clock in the evening; and, Mr. President, I have been available in my office or in the Capitol throughout each day for many, many days prior to yesterday.

In the article which appeared on page 1 of the New York Times it is written that security officers and snoopers invaded my office to detect whether it was the source of a security leak. Mr. President, I insist on knowing who directed that inspection. Was the inspection special in character, or was it of a routine nature? If special in character, I demand to know who on my staff was under suspicion. If routine, I demand to know who had the authority to order the inspection. Did the Armed Services Committee or any member of the Armed Services Committee order the inspection? Did the Defense Department order it? Did the Capitol Police order it? If the inspection was merely routine, as is now claimed, why should a newspaper be informed of it and be given the right to publish an article from which damaging inferences may be drawn.

Mr. President, I think my colleagues know me well enough for me to say that no one has a greater desire than I have to protect the security of our country and to keep information which has been developed from possible enemy scrutiny.

Let me say here that I have been deeply shocked at leaks which have occurred in or from Senate committees in the case of vital matters affecting the security of our country, and I have also sometimes been shocked at what has been said on the floor of the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I say to you that if those officers who demanded the right, in my absence, to inspect my offices, had communicated with me, I would not only have given them permission, but I would have cooperated in every possible way in the inspection of my office premises or in any other manner that was desirable.

Mr. President, I believe that every Member of this body has as great a devotion to his country as does any other Member or any official of the Federal Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for a moment? I must soon leave the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope that my friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], will understand.

First, Mr. President, I wish to say that when the Senator from New York notified me, this morning, of this action, I was amazed; I was shocked; I could not conceive that such outrageous treatment could be accorded any Member of the Senate.

It is my view, Mr. President, that every Member of this body will frown upon the action which took place on yesterday.

The majority leader immediately called for a full and complete report from the Capitol Police as to what part they played in this action. The majority leader wishes to assure the Senator from New York that as soon as the report is available, the majority leader, in cooperation, I trust, with the minority leader, will take such action as may be indicated.

I think the Senator from New York has presented to the Senate evidence of what I consider to be typical, bureaucratic, flatfoot stupidity. I think the Senator from New York is deserving of an apology, and the Senate of the United States is deserving of an apology, not only from one of its own employees, but from the great Defense Department of the Nation, if the facts as related by the Senator from New York and as published in the New York Times are confirmed.

On behalf of the Senate, I express my utter disgust at the action taken, my deep regret that any employee of the Senate would participate, my utter horror that the Defense Department of the Nation would permit its agents to be ransacking Senators' offices. If they can inspect the refrigerator in the office of the Senator from New York on yesterday, who knows but what on tomorrow they will be inspecting the desk of the minority leader or the majority leader or the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. President, I hope that every Member of this body will denounce in the strongest possible terms the ill-advised action which took place on yesterday; and I appreciate the Senator's bringing it to our attention.

I apologize for interrupting him; but I have an engagement at 1 o'clock which I must keep, and I did not want this opportunity to pass without expressing myself as forcibly and as deeply as I could.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Texas, the eminent majority leader, for his remarks, which are greatly appreciated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from New York for only several moments?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say that my regret is that a young man from New

Mexico, working for the United States Senate, should dare to do that. I am happy that he was not an appointee of mine. But on behalf of the people of New Mexico, whom I know well—people of both political parties—I apologize to the Senator from New York, and I want to take my part in denouncing such an action.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me? I have to leave for a meeting which I must attend.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New York, with all due respect to his problem, inasmuch as he has brought my name into this matter, I must ask him to yield to me.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri, after yielding to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Let me say to my distinguished friend that I associate myself completely with the comments made by the distinguished majority leader. Either someone moved into the Senator's office with some premeditated design to do something, or those who entered exercised the utmost stupidity and poor judgment in following that course of conduct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Washington very much, indeed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri, chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The first the Senator from Missouri knew of this incident was when I read an article in the New York Times this morning. The article reads, in part:

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, who conducts the hearings, said that though the check was merely a routine precautionary measure, similar procedure had never been used before in Senate hearings.

I had never discussed the incident with anyone from the New York Times or any other newspaper. The first I knew about it was when I read the article in question this morning.

However, inasmuch as what appeared to be involved was new procedure on the part of the Department of Defense, on May 17, when it was noticed by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself that these men were not in the room, the next day we had a colloquy on the subject. One of the men involved was one of the individuals who entered the office of the distinguished junior Senator from New York. I read from the record:

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you come forward a minute, please? Which one of you is in charge?

Mr. MORGAN. I am, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is your name?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Morgan, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And whom do you represent?

Mr. MORGAN. I am from OSD Security Office.

Senator SYMINGTON. Yesterday when I went into the washroom while the briefing

was going on, well after 5 o'clock, there was nobody there. Why was that?

SECURITY CHECK OF HEARING ROOM

Mr. MORGAN. Sir, we do not always stay for the full period. We run through our procedure 2 or 3 times and then sometimes leave.

Senator SYMINGTON. What hours do you observe?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, for instance here instead of quitting while you people are all here we will stay with you.

Senator SYMINGTON. What time did you leave yesterday?

Mr. MORGAN. 4:15.

Senator SYMINGTON. And what time did you leave the day before?

Mr. MORGAN. I don't believe there was anything Monday.

Senator SYMINGTON. Then the last time before that what time did you leave?

Mr. MORGAN. Six o'clock, I believe it was Friday night.

Senator SYMINGTON. I noticed it and some people mentioned it to me.

Are we to understand this is a periodic test, or a constant test?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, we figure that if anybody was going to get anything out by that late period, they would have started a transmission out of there by then.

Senator SYMINGTON. Don't you think if anybody was really interested in bugging the room of a hearing like this, that they would know when you came in and when you left?

Mr. MORGAN. I was told yesterday, sir, that the meeting was about over and that you were going to vote at that time so I figured the hearing itself was over.

The man speaking on May 17 is a member of the Department of Defense. Continuing to read from the record:

Senator SYMINGTON. We are not asking you this in any criticism. I have heard a good many briefings in this building, on far more secret things than we are discussing. We have never had this routine before to the best of my knowledge. We periodically check the committee rooms if I remember a statement made by the chairman of the full committee.

As we do with all other witnesses, will you raise your hand and be sworn, please?

Do you swear that you will give the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth to this Senate Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Senate Armed Services Committee, so help you God?

Mr. MORGAN. I do, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you give us details as to whom you report and what your instructions were when you came over here and what we are to expect in the future?

Mr. HAMILTON. You can supply that for the record.

Mr. MORGAN. At a later date?

Senator SYMINGTON. At a later date.

Mr. MORGAN. All right, sir.

(The requested information is as follows:)

"I, Clark A. Morgan, a representative of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Security Office, make the following statement for the record in compliance with a request of May 17, 1956, by the chairman of the subcommittee.

"The standard operating procedure of this Office normally consists of a visual inspection and radio monitoring of an area immediately prior to a conference to insure that no clandestine listening devices are in operation within the area. Spot monitoring is also conducted during a conference to insure that no remotely controlled clandestine transmitters are put into operation during a conference.

"The procedures used during the present closed hearings of this subcommittee consist of the above-listed standard operating

procedure or 1 of the 3 variations listed below:

"(1) If a closed session immediately follows an open hearing, time does not permit a complete visual inspection of the area and only the radio-monitoring phase is conducted.

"(2) Radio monitoring is conducted for approximately 3 hours if the monitoring is conducted from an area immediately adjacent to the conference room, and if the departure of the monitoring team would create no undue disturbance or attract attention.

"(3) If the monitoring is conducted from the conference room itself, the monitoring team remains until the session is concluded to prevent interruption to the hearing by the packing of monitoring equipment and departure of the monitoring team.

"In the future the procedure in covering the subcommittee will follow the above-listed standard operating procedure, or 1 of the 3 variations, unless otherwise directed."

Apparently this testimony, taken in executive session on May 17 and subsequently printed, was the basis for the article, because I had not discussed this matter with any reporter.

As soon as I read the article I called for the policeman involved and talked with him. The junior Senator from New York later called me. The subcommittee thereupon held an open hearing this morning, and took the sworn testimony of the policeman and the two members of the Department of Defense referred to.

The men involved are representatives of the Security Office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. He stated in the testimony this morning that he did this work at the request of "legislative liaison."

Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, which knew absolutely nothing about the episode of yesterday, and which already had discussed the operations of these gentlemen, I express our apologies to the Senator from New York for the inconvenience caused to him.

The testimony is not entirely clear about what occurred. It would appear the incident is merely another example of overeager bureaucracy.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I was very confident that he would not in any way sanction a procedure of this kind.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We held an open hearing this morning. If agreeable to my friend from New York, I should like to place in the RECORD tomorrow, or after it is typed, the testimony given by the two gentlemen and the policeman who entered his office yesterday.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should be very grateful to the Senator if he would do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the chairman of the subcommittee, has expressed apologies on his own behalf and on behalf of the subcommittee. He has our complete authority in expressing such apology. I join with him in doing so.

I think this incident resulted from the eagerness of two rather young gentlemen to do their duty as fully as they could. As was stated by the Senator from Missouri, the evidence given in public session will show that there was some part of the wallpaper or wall covering which was torn. They wanted to see where the hole led. They first asked the Capitol Police officer to go into the ladies' restroom. They found that the ventilator did not connect with the ladies' restroom, but did connect with the room next door. They stated that they did not know whose room it was, but, led by the officer, they asked the secretary of the Senator from New York if they could see what was in the room. She said she would see if anyone was in there. They then entered. They saw where the ventilator was. They stuffed some paper into the hole and left.

They should have asked the Senator's permission before they entered his office. They did ask the police officer to ask the lady who was in charge, and then they went in. They did not know, they stated, whose office it was. They did not know what the room was. All they knew was that this ventilator connected with it.

As a member of the subcommittee, I join in the sentiments expressed by the chairman, and I do so as emphatically as I can. I regret very much that the Senator from New York has been the victim of an utterly unjustified intrusion. We hope he will forget it, and try to think that the incident never occurred, because it certainly was not aimed at him or anyone in his office. Because there was a torn piece of paper over a hole which opened into a ventilator, these individuals, in their eagerness to be as thorough as possible, wondered if there was any connection between the hearing taking place in the next room and the tearing of a piece of paper from the ventilator.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the distinguished Senator from New York, will permit, I would change the word "apology" to "regret." The subcommittee has no authority whatever over these people. The subcommittee would like to express its very deep regret to the distinguished Senator from New York. It is not an apology. In my opinion, the apology should come from the Department of Defense.

Mr. LEHMAN. I agree with the Senator from Missouri very definitely.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. As a member of the subcommittee I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and to say that I regret very much that this incident occurred. I am sure I speak for all members of the subcommittee when I say there is no Member of the Senate who is more anxious to protect the United States against disclosure of

security information than is the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to say, as minority leader, that I, too, regret that this incident happened. I am not a member of the subcommittee. However, judging by the article in the New York Times and from the statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate, it is apparent to me that if the agents had come to any one of the 96 Senators and had said they were trying to protect the security of the country, every one of the Senators would have been glad to cooperate with them.

They very poorly performed their duties, indeed, in going into the office of the Senator from New York without any prior knowledge being given to the Senator from New York.

I hope no similar incident ever arises again in the history of the Senate with respect to any Member on either side of the aisle. The Senator from New York is quite within his rights and quite properly has brought the matter to the attention of the Senate. I am sure the men who were performing their duty thought they were acting in the interest of the security of the country, because there have been occasions, as I am sure the Senator knows, even in American Embassies abroad when electronic devices have been planted by which information was picked up. In this instance the men involved were apparently trying to make certain that there was no such leakage of information possible. However, the procedures were all wrong, and they should not be countenanced. I join with the other expressions by other Members of the Senate in this regard.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am grateful to the Senator from California.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, this is a regrettable incident. I merely wish to ask one question. Did the men ask someone on the Senator's staff if they could come into his office?

Mr. LEHMAN. They asked no one to my knowledge who had authority to grant such permission.

Mr. CAPEHART. But they did ask someone on the Senator's staff; is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; they just came in, and they were in.

Mr. CAPEHART. Was someone from the Senator's staff present when they came in?

Mr. LEHMAN. My receptionist was there; yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. She happened to be there at the time?

Mr. LEHMAN. She was there in line of duty. That is her place in the office. I happened to be out of the office at the time.

Mr. CAPEHART. But they spoke to the Senator's receptionist and asked her if they could do what they did?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, according to her, they just walked past her. She tried to stop them, and they flashed their badges. They said they had authority to do it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did they ask her whether they could enter the room?

Mr. LEHMAN. They did not ask her.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think this is a regrettable incident. It is certainly very regrettable. It was probably due to their enthusiasm. As I understand, the two men from the Defense Department did go in with the policeman.

Mr. SYMINGTON. They did.

Mr. CAPEHART. He escorted them into the room?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to say to the Senator from Indiana that the first I heard of this incident was when I returned to my office after being on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think it is regrettable.

Mr. LEHMAN. I returned to the office at 5 o'clock. I immediately called up the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Joseph C. Duke, and insisted that he make an investigation of this whole matter.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator from New York was 100 percent right. It is a regrettable incident.

Mr. LEHMAN. I will not take up very much more time of the Senate. I have only one or two more comments to make. Every Member of the Senate—and I wish to emphasize this, Mr. President—has as great devotion to his country and its security as has the Secretary of Defense. Every Member of the Senate is just as loyal as the Secretary of Defense. Every Member of the Senate, I know, would exert every effort to protect the security of the country.

There can be no excuse, however, for the assumption of authority by the Capitol Police or by the office of the Secretary of Defense in the manner demonstrated by this intrusion. We ought to know, if we do not know already, that the members of the Capitol Police are, in almost all cases, political appointees. The Defense Department, of course, is a bureau of the administrative branch of the Government. I cannot believe that the Senate would abdicate its independence to any bureau of the administrative branch of the Government, whether it be the Defense Department or any other department.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I regret that I was in attendance at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and missed the beginning of the Senator's discussion of this incident. Was it the Senator's understanding that the young Capitol Police officer who escorted the men into the Senator's office, was acting out of order?

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was the Capitol Police officer doing something that he should not have done?

Mr. LEHMAN. The three men came into my office and simply barged in and sought to examine a part of my office. That particular part of my office houses my office refrigerator and certain other paraphernalia used by my clerical staff and my two messengers.

Mr. ANDERSON. The young man in question, a member of the Capitol Police force, is my patronage appointee, with the name of Gilbert Encinias. As I understand—and I hope the Senator will correct me if I am wrong—he escorted the men into the Senator's office for the purpose of finding out whether a flue, which leads from the hearing room into the Senator's room, was communicating voices. Is that the information of the Senator from New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no idea what the name of the young man is, or specifically what he and the others were looking for.

Mr. ANDERSON. His name is Gilbert Encinias.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not know whether he came from New Mexico or from New York. However, 1 of the 3 men was a member of the Capitol Police force, and he came to my office with 2 men who were later identified, according to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services, as men who came from the Office of the Secretary of Defense. I have no idea what they were looking for. Perhaps they were looking for something sinister. I do not know.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator knows, I am sure, that they were not looking for anything sinister. What they do is this: If secret information is being given out in a room during a hearing, there has always been a responsibility to check adjoining rooms to see whether voices carry through partitions or flues. I have talked with the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Duke, and he tells me that that is a perfectly routine examination, which goes on in the office of any Senator. I have also talked with the chief of the Capitol Police, and asked him how his man got into the matter, and the captain said it was because the man had been detailed with instructions to accompany the two men to see that they did what they always do.

Mr. LEHMAN. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that I have occupied the same suite of offices for 7 years, and 1 room is adjacent to the hearing room, room 457. There is no doubt that many hearings have been held in the hearing room, and I have no doubt that in some cases some testimony of a confidential nature has been given. The particular hearing held yesterday was a continuation of the hearing which had been held in the same room for several days.

I wish to point out—and I cannot emphasize this too strongly—that I am just as much devoted to the protection of security in the Senate and elsewhere as is anyone else, whether it be the Secretary of Defense or any other official. What I am objecting to, however, is that this inspection was made without communication whatsoever with the Senator involved—I being that Senator—of course, without his permission, and without a request for cooperation, which would have been given with great pleasure and with great enthusiasm. But this incident occurred yesterday while I was absent, and there was no consultation, no permission asked, no authorization

requested of the Senator who occupied those quarters.

I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that he is perfectly correct. If there is a ventilator or an opening between two rooms which should be protected, all that was necessary, if it was possible to hear—and I do not know whether it was or was not—was to put up a piece of cardboard, a blanket, a sheet, or a cover of some kind between the two rooms, and no sound could have come through.

But I cannot believe that we in the Senate are going to abdicate our independence to the wishes and to the rules of the Department of Defense or any other department in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator that when I became a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the first time there was a meeting in my office at which secret and confidential information was to be revealed to me by members of the joint committee or of the staff, I requested the AEC to check my office to see if there were microphones anywhere in it. I did not regard that as an invasion of my rights. I was only trying to make sure that secret information was not made available to those unauthorized to have it.

I think if such a suggestion had been made to the Senator from New York, he would have been the first to agree and to insist that security precautions be observed.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New Mexico knows that to be so. But for someone to come from the Department of Defense and arbitrarily proceed to inspect my office spaces, to inspect them without authorization, I think amounts to violating the right of a Senator. I am told—I was not told yesterday, and I do not know whether it is true or not—that this was a routine inspection. If it was a routine inspection such as that to which the Senator has referred in connection with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, why was the news given to the newspapers? Why was it that one newspaper carried the story, which, inevitably, contained inferences of a serious and possibly damaging nature?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator knows the answer to that, does he not?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I do not.

Mr. ANDERSON. As the group went into the office, permission was requested to go into the Senator's office. I wish to assure the Senator that I have had only a few minutes' conversation on this incident and have not talked to the individuals concerned at all, but I understand that permission was granted to enter the Senator's office. As they left the office there was heated conversation outside the office which newspaper reporters could not help overhearing. The conversation came from members of the Senator's own staff, and not from the officers.

Mr. LEHMAN. To me it is an amazing thing. Of course, if anyone claims to have credentials, no one in an inferior position, such as that of a receptionist, is going to deny the right to inspect. But that does not change this situation.

Mr. President, there can be no excuse for the assumption of authority by the Capitol Police or by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The members of the Capitol Police are in almost all cases political appointees. The Defense Department is a part of the executive branch of the Government. I do not believe that we in the Senate are ready today or ever will be ready to abdicate our independence to any department or bureau of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, we have come a far distance down the road. We have built a thick and almost suffocating atmosphere which today pervades the Halls of the United States Congress and the Senate Office Building, and which permits such an incident as I have described to take place. It is unconscionable, to my mind, that the Defense Department should engage in completely unauthorized acts in the Senate Office Building. If leakage is suspected, they should solicit the cooperation of the Senators who have adjoining offices—if that is the form of leakage suspected—and not act as if they suspect the Senators and their staffs too.

In my judgment, Mr. President, we have gone too far in this business of the invasion of privacy to detect breaches of so-called security. Everyone is suspected these days, and when everyone is suspected, there is no such thing as real security.

Mr. President, I believe this is an intolerable situation, in which each man walks constantly on the precipice of infamy from which he can be pushed by any careless snooper, by any irresponsible order issued by any irresponsible and overzealous security officials.

Mr. President, I ask the Secretary of Defense for justification and for an explanation of this incident. I ask that this insult to the United States Senate—for so I view it—be wiped out and that steps be immediately taken so that similar incidents cannot again occur.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to say, along with the other Members of the Senate who have participated in this discussion, that every Member of this body knows the devoted loyalty, patriotism, and dedication of the Senator from New York. We regard his loyalty, patriotism, and dedication as unsurpassed in the Nation.

I think it is exceedingly regrettable that this incident has occurred. There are constitutional protections regarding search and seizure in civil life. A search requires a writ. In public life it is at least desirable to have notification, particularly when Members of the Senate serve on committees to which confidential information is given. Apparently, they trust us sufficiently, if we are in the room, to hear what they have to say.

It appears to me that if they would take the time to make an advance request of the Senator, or of his administrative assistant, who in turn could communicate with the Senator, there would be complete and wholehearted compliance and cooperation.

Very frankly, in my opinion, the Capitol Police have difficult tasks to perform in connection with the Senate. I think they do good work, despite some of the criticisms which are leveled against them at times.

Also, I feel certain that the Capitol Police officer, as did the Senator's receptionist, stood in some awe and respect of the officials of the Department of Defense, who had credentials as investigators. On occasion, such officials call at our offices for the purpose of inquiring about personnel matters relating to Federal appointments. I may say that the average employee in a Senator's office, as is true of the average citizen, sometimes stands in fear, and always in awe, of a Federal officer who is empowered with investigatory or inspection authority. I think all of us should remember that. People sometimes are prone to become panicky at the sight of an officer who seems to be quite officious and determined to proceed forthwith to complete his assignment.

If I may make one suggestion, it is that the rooms be investigated. The sooner that can be done, the better. I should like to know how many telephones are being tapped. I do not know that they are, but I keep hearing that they are. I should like to know whether any of the walls are "bugged," so to speak. I think it would be a good idea to have the whole building gone over; in fact, I recommend it, because from time to time important conferences are in progress. Furthermore, sometimes there are things being said which are not so important, but which I do not care to have other persons hear. I am sure others feel as I do about that.

The process of unrestrained snooping is not within the dignity of Congress or of the Government. I certainly am not accusing the Department of Defense of snooping. I think their motives in this instance were correct and proper, but their action was improper; their methodology was improper. I am sure that the officer concerned in this instance feels as regretful about what happened as does anyone else. But he felt he had an assignment, and, as in the case of a military command, he was going to carry it through.

I think the sooner the procedure is clarified, the better off we shall be. I feel certain that every Senator would like it to be known that he can be relied upon, if called upon, to give cooperation. I am certain, however, that every committee room in the Capitol has work in progress from time to time which requires the most careful inspection and scrutiny. Therefore, as the Senator from New Mexico has said, the inspection should be routine, but routine with Senators having knowledge of what is going on, as the Senator from New York has asked.

If I understand correctly the complaint of the Senator from New York—and it is a justifiable complaint, in my opinion—it is not so much what was done that concerns him, as it is the manner in which it was done. It is a fact that he, a United States Senator, and one of the most distinguished citizens of his coun-

try, was not informed of what was about to happen, was not asked to cooperate, and was told nothing. Finding his name flashed across the front page of a great newspaper, he has a right to become disturbed, because such statements, even in a reliable newspaper, always leave some lingering doubts. There is hardly any retraction which can erase such a record, because people in public life are controversial figures. I think it is unfortunate that this has happened.

The affection, the esteem, and the respect of the colleagues of the junior Senator from New York will be like a mighty fortress for him in this particular instance, because no Member of the Senate could be more loyal to his country, even to the point of laying down his life for it than the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I appreciate sincerely the very generous comments made by the junior Senator from Minnesota about me. There is no question that every possible means must be used to insure security in the hearings which are being held. I wish there could be more security in the debates in the Senate than actually occurs. I wish there could be greater security in every other way. It seems to me that such security should be provided by the Senate itself. I do not think there should be set up in the various committees little teams of snoopers and little teams of investigators from the Department of Defense, a department which has no connection whatsoever with the committees of the Senate. I do not believe each committee separately should decide whether it wants to have snoopers going around and inspecting persons for their loyalty and considering such related factors. I think it would be perfectly proper—and I wish we could have more of it—to have made a real security check of the rooms of the Senate, especially in connection with some of the deliberations which take place in the hearings. But that security check should be made by the Senate itself when the question of security is under consideration. The same is true also of the House.

But I do not think it is necessary to bring into the picture the Department of Defense, which is in no way whatsoever connected with the legislative branch, and over which we have no control and no influence. I think its activities are something entirely different.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is unnecessary for Senators to express their confidence in the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I myself have never known a nobler man in public life than the junior Senator from New York, whose life has clearly been devoted to the best interests of the people of the United States.

All of us not only regret but are indignant about what happened. But we know that it will not hurt the Senator from New York, because his life and reputation are so firmly established that they are beyond attack by anyone.

I think the Senator from New York has proposed a very interesting idea. I

should like to make now a formal suggestion to the Committee on Rules and Administration; namely, that the committee engage experts in electronic devices to inspect all hearing rooms and all adjoining rooms to determine whether security and privacy exist.

I suggest also that inspection be made of the offices of all Senators—every office—to ascertain whether there are any hidden recording devices and whether the telephone wires of Senators are being tapped. I suggest that following such an inspection a report be made to the Senate. I further suggest that the membership of the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration which would conduct the investigation be composed of Senators from both parties.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very appreciative of the remarks of the Senator from Illinois. I hope I have made it clear that I am not at all worried about this matter from a personal standpoint. I think my record demonstrates very clearly what I have stood for and fought for. I have no fear of any article of this sort, so far as its affecting my own life is concerned. But I have a very great concern about what is happening in connection with many matters relating to security.

As the Senator from Illinois knows, all my adult life I have been heart and soul against wire tapping. I do not know whether my wires are tapped. They may be. I would not be surprised if they were, although I have absolutely no proof of it. I have been against the use of all other subtle devices which are used to entangle people unfairly and unjustly and to deprive them of their civil rights and liberties. I am steadfastly opposed to the use of wire tapping and similar devices. I think that is the important point.

When men come into a Senator's office and brush aside his receptionist, a person who has no authority whatsoever, and who neither gave nor withheld permission because she felt that she could not do so as merely a receptionist—when such a group comes into a Senator's office and preempts the right to make an inspection without consultation with the Senator, I think it is simply one example of what may happen if we are not careful.

I do not think anybody is going to try to inspect the premises of the Senator from New Mexico, or the Senator from Illinois, or the Senator from New York. I do not know whether other things may be done, but we know they have been done frequently in other countries. We know they could be done here. That is why, although I do not have the slightest concern in the world about the effect of the article in the New York Times on my own personal fortunes, nor have I any fear at all of the effect of the incident itself, I felt that I could not possibly remain silent under the circumstances which I have recounted, because, in my opinion, they are serious circumstances. I think they are circumstances fraught with great dangers to the future of this body, which we all agree is the greatest legislative body in the world. It has maintained its independence. The

minute we surrender our independence, then I think we are through, and I think the country is through.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). Has the Senator from New York yielded the floor?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I have not.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President—

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in my anxiety to keep the record straight with respect to what happened yesterday in the subcommittee, I did not express, as I should have, my deep respect and affection for the distinguished Senator from New York. In the years I have been in the Senate, I have always felt he was one of the most outstanding and patriotic Americans who have ever graced this body and I am especially sorry this unfortunate incident occurred in connection with a subcommittee on which I serve.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield now to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the Senator from New York refers to the possibility that somebody could be worried to see this happening in his office, I may say to him that, so far as I am concerned, if anybody in the country could have the slightest doubt about the patriotism and loyalty of the able Senator from New York, that person would be in a pretty bad way, indeed, because we have all watched the Senator from New York over a long period of years. So far as I am concerned, nothing could happen that would in the slightest concern me on that subject. I will always recognize his loyalty and patriotism under any circumstances.

Secondly, I should like to say I think the Senator from New York has brought to the attention of the Senate something that is important to us, and that is that if an examination is made in any Senator's office, it ought to be made only with the approval of the Senator concerned. I join him in the statement he has made in that connection.

I should like to say, however, that the use of recording devices and machinery of that nature is not unique. The Senator from New York may remember that when there was a change in the Cabinet some years ago, more than 1,000 pounds of recording equipment were taken from that Cabinet member's office and another 800 pounds from his dining room, all of which had been used to obtain records of conversations between him and Members of the House and Senate, without knowledge of such Members.

I think the Senator from New York may have inadvertently served the country very well in the misfortune that has happened to him. It may result in our being able to say that none of these things shall be allowed to take place without approval of the Senator, if there is going to be an examination. I agree with the Senator completely that we must not have it done in any other fashion. To the extent that the personal approval of the Senator is not obtained, it ought not to be allowed.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I had not known of the incident which he related with reference to the 1,000 pounds of material which was taken from the office of a Cabinet member. It was a Cabinet member, was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. LEHMAN. Who listened in on conversations?

Mr. ANDERSON. He had some push-buttons under his desk. As one would participate in a conversation with him, he would push buttons, so that the person who was talking would have his voice recorded a little more clearly. Later, pounds and pounds and pounds of recording equipment were removed from the Cabinet member's office. I once had luncheon in that Cabinet member's office. He asked me a great many questions. He asked me about the political chances of my predecessor in the Senate, Carl Hatch, who is now a Federal judge. He asked me questions concerning political complications if my colleague ran for office. These conversations were carefully winnowed, and the three or four words that "Carl Hatch was going to have a hard run" were handed around, and certain persons were told, "Look what this man thinks about you."

I think that there ought to be warning signals like buzzers or beepers, when recorders are used on telephones. If a conversation is being recorded, the person on the other end of the line should be notified.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator has made a very interesting statement. I have no knowledge of the former Cabinet officer to whom he has referred, but regardless of who he was, I certainly condemn the procedure wholeheartedly. The mere fact that the Senator from New Mexico has related something that happened some years ago shows the danger of this thing. How can anybody sanction or approve that sort of procedure?

The Senator from New Mexico has stated that perhaps the junior Senator from New York has inadvertently done a service to the country by bringing up this matter. I want him to know that I did not do it inadvertently. I did it with complete knowledge of what I was doing, and in the hope that I was rendering a service to the country by bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and the country. It was not done inadvertently. It was done deliberately, and it was done with all the force at my command.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say to the Senator I had intended to try to remove the word "inadvertent" from my remarks, because it was not what I intended to say. I was trying to say, or I started to say, that the Senator from New York, in calling attention to one thing, had brought out the necessity of making sure that there was a rule which would prevent any one doing this sort of thing, without going first to the Senator himself. That is what I meant by what I said.

I also think that if somebody can come into a Senator's office for the purpose of checking it to see if voices travel through a flue, they might come in for other

purposes. Therefore, I do not think they should come in without prior approval and watchfulness of the Senator himself. I am deeply sorry they came in under the circumstance related by the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President—

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Anyone who wears the Distinguished Service Medal should not have his patriotism questioned. Anyone who has served the Senate, his State, and the country as long as has the Senator from New York cannot have his honesty questioned. I share the resentment of the Senator from New York over the act that was performed.

I expressed a similar resentment on the floor of the Senate not many weeks ago against the president of the Americans for Democratic Action, who paid money for information obtained fraudulently from Paul Hughes, and which proved to be lies, against a Member of the United States Senate.

I hope the distinguished Senator from New York will include in his expressions of resentment Joseph L. Rauh, president of Americans for Democratic Action, for his uncalled for, sneaking attack on a Member of the United States Senate by means exactly the same as those over which the Senator from New York expresses resentment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Arizona that I am not in any way familiar with the incident to which he has referred. But I can make the general statement, categorically, and without qualification, that I would resent the use of any kind of listening device in order to obtain political advantage, whether in the case of a member of the ADA or a member of the Republican Party or a member of the Democratic Party. I am opposed to all of it, and I always have been, and I always will be, because I think it is iniquitous and bad. I hope the Senate will not lend itself to that in any way, at any time, or under any circumstances.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to hear the Senator from New York express himself in that way, because, knowing him as I do, I thought he was not aware of the facts concerning Mr. Rauh, the president of the ADA. I know that if the Senator from New York will study the documents I placed in the RECORD regarding the Paul Hughes case, he will include in his resentment the president of the ADA.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been a lifelong liberal.

Mr. LEHMAN. Who has been a lifelong liberal, Mr. President?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have been a lifelong liberal. That is why I feel as I do, and why I desire to make the statement I shall make.

First, let me say that I feel that a Senator's office and everything that happens within it is public business. I cannot conceive that anything which may happen in a Senator's office—whether

correspondence or anything else of any nature—does not belong to the public. Personally, I do not think that anything in a Senator's office should be protected against anything except thievery.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to complete my statement, please, Mr. President.

I think a Senator's office is public property, and is used for public business. I cannot conceive that a single piece of correspondence either coming into or going out of a Senator's office does not belong to the public. I think we are conducting the public business.

The Senate makes its own rules. The Senate appointed the policeman. If I correctly understand the situation, a Senate policeman, and two other persons, went to the receptionist of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and said they wanted to look at one office. If a Capitol policeman asked to be allowed to look at any of the rooms in a Senator's office, I do not think a single member of any Senator's staff in Washington would have said anything except, "Of course come on in." Under those circumstances, I do not think a single staff member would have said anything except, "Certainly come on in," because the business we are conducting is the public business. We are not here on private business. At least, that is my view of the matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask the Senator from New Mexico to wait a moment, please.

Mr. President, so far as I personally am concerned, the police can walk into my office and can read every piece of mail there—every piece of mail I have received or every piece of mail I have written. They can come there whenever they wish to. What is so secret about a Senator's office?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Just this, Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Mexico to wait a moment, please I have not yielded.

Mr. President, what is so secret about a Senator's office? What are we afraid of? We are engaged on the public business. We are the servants of the public. Particularly, when a policeman the Senate has appointed is engaged in checking into matters, I do not know why we should make such a fuss about something of this nature honestly I do not, Mr. President.

Now I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LEHMAN. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Indiana cannot yield. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to answer the question. Of course a Senator's business is public business. But would the Senator from Indiana want anyone in Washington or any policeman or any administrative assistant from any other office to go into his office and attend to the public business

he undertakes to perform for Indiana? Would he?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not understand the question. Will the Senator from New Mexico repeat it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the Senator from Indiana want my administrative assistant to investigate the Senator's files in connection with the public business in which he is engaged?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no objection at all, if such a request is made of my receptionist, saying, "I should like to come into your office." I do not think I would particularly want him to go through the files, but it is public business.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No one is more interested in the public business than I am; and in connection with the public business, I keep closely in touch with the people of my State, and they are entitled to service.

But any policeman from the Pentagon, badge or no badge, had better not come into my office and do what was done in the office of the Senator from New York.

Mr. CAPEHART. If a Capitol policeman came to the Senator's receptionist and said he would like to have a look at the physical properties in room so-and-so, I imagine the receptionist would say, "Certainly; come in and take a good look."

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Indiana does not know my receptionist. [Laughter.] Ordinarily she would throw such a person out on his ear.

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps that is true in the Senator's office.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. But in my office, we are such great liberals, and believe in the public trust, that we would say, "Of course; come take a look."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; but I do not trust any Tom, Dick, or Harry, in spite of his badges. That is the only difference between the Senator from Indiana and myself.

The point I am trying to make is this: Of course all of us are interested in the public business. For instance, today or tomorrow we are going to submit the conference report on the big road bill, which is public business. But would the Senator from Indiana say that because it is public business, any Tom, Dick, or Harry could go to the Committee on Public Works and rifle the files?

Mr. CAPEHART. I said that I am opposed to thievery, and certainly I am opposed to thievery.

But I am looking at the matter from the broad, liberal standpoint that what we do here is the public business, because I am a great liberal, and I always have been; and I think the members of the public are entitled to know what is going on within our offices.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, unfortunately I have to leave the Chamber to attend a meeting of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. So I am afraid I shall have to yield the floor.

But before doing so, I wish to say one word to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. President, I am 78 years old, and I have learned many things. I have always proceeded on the theory that we

live to learn. Today I have learned something for the first time—at least, I have heard the claim made, and it is something of great interest to me; for the first time I have heard anyone describe the distinguished Senator from Indiana as a great liberal. [Laughter.] But then, of course, the Senator from Indiana has a fine sense of humor.

Mr. President, I wish to make it very clear that the Senator from Indiana is perfectly correct in saying that a Senator's business is the business of the Nation, and that a Senator has no right to keep anything from the people he represents or from the people of the Nation as a whole. I have proceeded on that theory. My files have been wide open to anyone who had authority or who had a reason for asking me for my opinion or about my attitude or my stand on any public question.

I think I can make that statement without fear of contradiction. But it is one thing to give permission to question, to investigate, and to study to people who have authority, but it is quite a different thing to give it to people who have no authority. No one can tell me that the Department of Defense, which is a department of the executive branch of the Government, has the right to come to the Senate of the United States and demand anything.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall yield when I am through.

They may be asked to do it, but I have been told by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that these men were not asked to do it. They certainly have no right to do it; and if the Senate is ever willing to state that they have the right to do it, I believe we shall lose our independence to a very considerable extent.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know whether they had the right or not, but they did go to the Capitol Police, who represent the Senate, whose members are appointed by the Senate, and they asked that a member of the Capitol Police go with them. He went with them. They asked a representative of the United States Senate to go with them.

The Senator says that if a thing like that can happen, he is afraid that we shall lose our liberties. I say that I am afraid of it when I hear talk, as I have heard today from Senators, to the effect that we ought to adopt regulations which would prohibit anyone from doing such things. It is then that I would become fearful.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am already late for my appointment; but let me say to my friend from Indiana that I do not believe that in establishing the Capitol Police force we intended to invest its members with any such authority. Reluctantly, we must confess, the Capitol force is a purely political organization. It is a patronage organization, to which both the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from New York have made appointments, possibly on a political basis. I do not think that any of

us believes that we should give to the Capitol Police the untrammelled right to investigate our offices without specific authorization from the Senate in each case or in all cases.

When I ask for the appointment of a man to the Capitol Police force, to preserve order here and protect the property and personnel of the Capitol and its appurtenances, I do not believe that I am recommending a person who will have delegated to him powers which must belong to the Senate itself. I do not think the officers of the Capitol Police would want such powers, except under carefully circumscribed conditions, and by specific authorization of the Senate or the Senator in each case.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I stated a moment ago that I thought the incident was regrettable. I think it would have been better if the individuals involved had spoken to the Senator. But the point is that they did approach one of his employees. They were accompanied by a member of the Capital Police force. Members of that force are appointed by the United States Senate. They are responsible to the Senate, and to the Senate only.

There was a room in which mutilation of the wall had taken place—

Mr. LEHMAN. What is that?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mutilation of the wall—

Mr. LEHMAN. No.

Mr. CAPEHART. Not in the Senator's office, but in the other office.

Mr. LEHMAN. No. The Senator must not say that. Whatever was in that room had been there for 7 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. I mean in the committee room.

Mr. LEHMAN. In the committee room, too. It has been there for much more than 7 years. I have been a Senator for 7 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not mean the Senator's office. I did not say it was the Senator's office. I said it was the committee room. The wall was mutilated; and those who were making the investigation had every right in the world to find out whether it was mutilated on the other side. Unfortunately, the other side happened to be in the office of the Senator from New York. No one knew but that someone might have planted a bomb there. We do not want to see police officers sitting around waiting to find out, under those circumstances, whether someone is trying to do physical harm to a United States Senator, or to members of the committee which meets there.

Mr. President, I think we are making a mountain out of a molehill. My best judgment is that we have been playing politics against the Defense Department of the United States. The so-called liberals who have been discussing the subject knew that they were playing politics with the situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order not to play politics with the Defense Department, I hope the Senator from Indiana will remain in the Chamber this afternoon and help the

committee, in connection with the Defense Department appropriation bill, to see that the Defense Department is given what it needs.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PANAMA CANAL IMPROVEMENTS: TERMINAL LAKE THIRD LOCKS PLAN APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE BY GOV. GLEN E. EDGERTON, JANU- ARY 17, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, in a brief address to the Senate on June 4, 1956, I quoted a number of informal statements on Isthmian Canal problems by eminent engineers and others with Panama Canal experience.

Recently, the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Hon. George H. Roderick, of Michigan, transmitted to me—following my inquiry—a declassified official 1944 preliminary report to the Secretary of War by Gov. Glen E. Edgerton of the Panama Canal (1940-1944) concerning the elimination of the Pedro Miguel locks in connection with the 1939 thirdlocks project. The proposal discussed in this report has been appropriately designated as the Terminal Lake third locks plan.

This plan, it should be noted, was developed in the Panama Canal organization from operating experience in World War II, 1941 to 1943, and before the advent of the atomic bomb. Because of its inherent logic and obvious navigational advantages, it received prompt attention by Canal Zone officials and won widespread technical support, including that of the Secretary of the Navy.

In his 1944 report, which was likewise prepared before the advent of the atomic bomb in 1945, Governor Edgerton evaluated the advantages and disadvantages of the plan from the engineering viewpoint and presented information of the highest importance to the Congress, and the Nation. To aid in its examination, I have prepared a brief summary of the main points of the report, which is commended for careful study by all concerned with the gravely important problem of the Panama Canal, especially cognizant committees of the Congress.

Though portions of Governor Edgerton's 1944 report may no longer pertain, its main evaluations still apply with even greater force. Thus, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, my summary of its highlights and my discussions of this matter, and immediately following my complete remarks I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the report be printed.

There being no objection, the summary, discussion, and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT POINTS IN GOV. GLEN E. EDGERTON'S REPORT ON ELIMINATION OF PEDRO MIGUEL LOCKS, JANUARY 17, 1944

The most significant points in Governor Edgerton's report are his:

1. Statement that "the wisdom of the adoption of the high-level plan in the original construction of the canal is completely established" (par. 71).

2. Disclosure of the origin of the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan in the Panama Canal organization in 1943 and its support by the Secretary of the Navy (pars. 1, 2, and 7).

3. Listing of key documents on the formulation of the plan and its submission to higher authority (pars. 1-6).

4. Admission of the navigational hazards in the Pacific sector of the third-locks project as originally laid out (par. 19) and of naval opposition to its completion in the form as first planned (par. 2).

5. Approval in principle of the Terminal Lake third locks plan (pars. 24-28) and recommendation to the Secretary of War for its thorough investigation (par. 136).

6. Estimates of costs (1944) for completion of the Terminal Lake third locks project varying from \$210 million to \$360 million (par. 94). (Compare these with present-day estimates for the sea-level project, between five and ten billion dollars.)

7. Recognition of the operational superiority of a lake-lock type canal over one at sea level (pars. 71 and 74).

8. Assertion that, notwithstanding the superior operational convenience of a lake-lock type canal, the arguments for a sea-level canal are based on the relative vulnerability of the lake-lock type and a sea-level type to damage by enemy attack (par. 72). As already pointed out this statement was made before the advent of the atomic bomb.

9. Warning that sea-level advocates would "oppose unjustifiably any expensive change in the present plans on the grounds that it would defer the time when the conversion of the existing canal to a sea-level waterway might otherwise be authorized" (par. 70).

By way of further explanation, it should be noted that the 1939 Third Locks project was suspended in May 1942. Some \$75 million was expended, mainly on excavation of lock sites at Gatun and Miraflores. No excavation was undertaken at Pedro Miguel.

The final report on the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan contemplated by Governor Edgerton was never submitted, as his program was superseded by the Isthmian Canal Studies under Public Law 280, 79th Congress. The 1947 report of these studies, because of the impact of the atomic bomb, appears to have been directed toward securing authorization of the 1947 sea-level project chiefly on the alleged basis of security from atomic attack.

Developments in thermonuclear weapons since 1947, in the opinion of competent, independent experts, have changed the entire canal picture from the defense standpoint by rendering the type of canal as essentially irrelevant. Whatever force these considerations may have had in 1946 and 1947, when the sea-level project report was prepared, has been wholly dissipated because of the tremendous advances in destructive powers of thermonuclear weapons—not to mention even greater advances in the future.

These facts restore the canal problem to securing adequate capacity and maximum operational convenience at least cost. For these purposes, the 1944 engineering evaluation of operational problems of the Panama Canal assume the highest character.

All of this, I may say, adds up to indicate the absolute importance for prompt action by the Congress to provide for the creation of an Inter-oceanic Canals Commission to study the entire canal problem as provided for in S. 766 and H. R. 3335, 84th Congress.

REPORT ON PROPOSALS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF PEDRO MIGUEL LOCKS OF THE PANAMA CANAL

SYNOPSIS

Modification of the authorized project for a third set of locks in the Panama Canal by 1 of 5 plans which contemplate the abandonment of all locks, existing and proposed,

at Pedro Miguel and the provision of 3-lift flights (or equivalent 2-lift flights) at Miraflores, has been suggested in order to obtain the operational advantages of an anchorage area at the Pacific end of Gaillard Cut and other benefits.

The plans are schematic and cannot be appraised with accuracy in the present stage of their investigation. The relative advantages and disadvantages are described and explained in this report. The major advantages are economic and are evaluated in the report at from about \$600,000 to \$1,070,000 per year. The additional costs of the several plans would range from \$30 million to \$180 million, and the additional time required for construction from 1½ to 3 years. Intangible factors of both war and peace are explained and discussed briefly.

One of the plans merits comprehensive investigation. Its feasibility is doubtful because of unfavorable foundation conditions. None of the other plans appears to be justifiable, but final conclusions in that respect, also, should be deferred until investigations in progress have been completed.

I. AUTHORITY, REFERENCES, AND SCOPE

Authority

1. This report is submitted in response to a letter from the Adjutant General, United States Army, September 18, 1943 (AG-381 [7 Sept. 1943] OB-S-E), to the Commanding General, Caribbean Defense Command, on the subject, Plan For the Improvement of the Panama Canal, transmitting copies of a letter of September 7, 1943, and its enclosures, from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of War, requesting study of the subject in order that the practicability and advisability of such a program might be discussed jointly and the President advised in the premises.

References

2. In addition to the two letters identified above, the references include the enclosures to the letter of the Secretary of the Navy which consist of copies of the following, listed in chronological order:

(a) Memorandum, February 25, 1943, to the Marine Superintendent of the Panama Canal, by the captain of the port, Balboa, on the subject, Panama Canal—Improvement of Operating Conditions and Increasing Capacity, with three enclosures.

(b) Memorandum, March 25, 1943, to the Marine Superintendent, by the captain of the port, Balboa, on the subject, Panama Canal—Proposed Plan for Improvement—Marine Features.

(c) Memorandum, March 26, 1943, to the Governor of the Panama Canal, by Mr. R. S. Randolph, consulting engineer, on the subject, Panama Canal—Proposed Improvement of Operating Conditions and Increasing Capacity.

(d) Memorandum, April 25, 1943, to the Marine Superintendent, by the captain of the port, Balboa, on the subject Panama Canal—Marine Features of the Sea Level and Lock Types Compared.

(e) Mimeographed copy of the Marine Operating Problems of the Panama Canal and the Solution, a lecture before the Panama section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, by Commander Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, captain of the port, Balboa, of the Panama Canal, May 25, 1943.

(f) Letter of June 17, 1943, from the Commandant, 15th Naval District, to the vice Chief of Naval Operations on the subject Panama Canal—Proposed Naval Plans for Its Immediate Improvement. A copy of the reference, Com. 15ND, file H. C. 1423 (01) of June 9, 1943, was not included with the copy of this letter.

(g) Endorsement 1, June 24, 1943, from the Vice Chief of Naval Operations to the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

(h) Endorsement 2, undated, from the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks to the Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

(i) Endorsement 3, July 15, 1943, from the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, to the Secretary of the Navy.

(j) Fourth endorsement, August 2, 1943, from Commander in Chief, United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations to the Secretary of the Navy.

3. The basic letter for purposes of this discussion is reference (f) in which the Commandant, 15th Naval District, urged immediate endorsement by the Navy Department of the general plan proposed in the enclosures to his letter. The enclosures to the basic letter, except reference (e), are copies of intraoffice communications of the Panama Canal for the consideration of the official addressed in each case. They are not in all cases well suited to consideration by others and should not be regarded as affording, by themselves, a satisfactory basis for final conclusions concerning the subjects presented.

4. Copies of these papers were furnished the Commandant, 15th Naval District, informally, as a matter of information on a subject of interest to him. The physical aspects of the general plan have been described orally during the course of occasional inspections of the locks and lock sites by the Commandant and visiting naval officials, but prior to the receipt of the references, no suggestion was made to this office that the Commandant desired to discuss the merits of the proposal or to make recommendations concerning its adoption. It is regrettable that in transmitting copies of these references from this office to the Commandant no mention was made of their incomplete and tentative nature. A number of errors in reference (f) might have been avoided if a caution of that kind had been given in time. However, the papers themselves, except reference (d), recognize the need for more information than they contain and their closing paragraphs include, appropriately, recommendations for further investigation.

5. Reference (h) suggests two additional plans and reference (j) contains brief pertinent comment and valuable suggestions in reference to additional data needed for the consideration of the subject.

6. In general, the references present an objective rather than a plan. They suggest schematic arrangements of locks, dams, and channels, but the evident purpose is to develop the best plan for accomplishing the objective, which is an anchorage basin above the locks at the Pacific end of the canal.

Scope of this report

7. The proposals under consideration are those presented by the captain of the port, Balboa, in reference (a) and amplified in references (b), (d), and (h). The essential purpose of the proposals is to modify the existing canal and the third locks project so as to eliminate the locks, existing and proposed, in the vicinity of Pedro Miguel and to create a basin at Gatun Lake level between the southern end of Gaillard Cut and the locks at Miraflores.

8. It should not be supposed that this conception is new or that it has not previously been appraised. On the contrary, the basic features of the plan, i. e., the concentration of the Pacific locks at Miraflores and the creation of an anchorage basin above the locks, are identical with those of the plan proposed in 1906 by Mr. William Gorg and in 1908 by Major William L. Sibert. The same plan was again suggested in 1909 by a board of consulting engineers headed by Mr. Frederic P. Stearns. Both Major Sibert and the Stearns Board listed economy of construction and operation as one of the reasons for proposing the consolidation of the Pacific locks, but both reports laid the greater stress on the value of the resulting

Miraflores anchorage basin to navigation, with particular reference to overcoming the effects of fogs in the cut on the capacity of the canal. Reasons for the rejection of the plan at that time were given by General Goethals, in his paper on the Panama Canal in Transactions of the International Engineering Congress, 1915, as: " * * the extent and character of the foundations which were the poorest under any of the structures on the Isthmus, the great depth to rock for part of the structures which imposed too great pressures, and the question of water supply; economy in the use of water resulted from the separation of the locks at Pedro Miguel and Miraflores."

9. However, since the present proposals are based on operating experiences and since the suspension of work on the third-locks project provides time for their careful reconsideration, investigation of the several plans was begun shortly after the receipt of the required copy of reference (a) by this office in March 1943. It is the purpose of this report to summarize the results to date of these investigations, which are not yet completed.

II. THE CANAL AND THE PROPOSED CHANGES

Existing features of the canal

10. In the interests of clarity, it is desired to outline the principal features of the canal, as they are now and as planned in the third locks project, to which reference must be made in the discussion of proposed changes. Plate I is a general map of the Canal Zone.

11. The canal is approximately 50 statute miles in length from deep water in the Caribbean Sea, usually referred to as the Atlantic end, to deep water in the Gulf of Panama, referred to as the Pacific end. From the Atlantic to the Pacific the general direction of the canal channel is southeast, but the Atlantic end and distances in that direction are referred to as north. Correspondingly, the banks and lateral distances are designated as east or west.

12. Proceeding from the Atlantic end, the canal channel is at sea level to Gatun, a distance of 7 miles. Two flights of locks of 3 lifts each (6 locks in all) at Gatun give access to Gatun Lake, the normal surface level of which is considered to be at elevation 85 (feet above sea level). Gatun Lake is created by Gatun Dam, an earth dam about 8,200 feet in length, extending across the valley of the Chagres River to the westward from Gatun locks and on both sides of the spillway, which was constructed in a natural hill near the center of the dam. The spillway is a gravity section concrete structure, with its crest at elevation 69. Above the crest of the spillway are 14 regulating gates, each 45 feet long and 19 feet high, with a discharge capacity of about 13,000 cubic feet per second with the lake at elevation 87. Gatun Lake has a superficial area of 163 square miles. It serves as a regulating basin for the tributary streams, affords about 800 acres of anchorage area for vessels of all sizes in the vicinity of Gatun locks, and provides a channel 1,000 feet wide, with greater widths at bends, and over 45 feet in depth to the vicinity of Barbacoas Island, about 15.5 miles from Gatun Locks. From Barbacoas Island to Camboa, near the northerly end of Gaillard Cut, about 7.5 miles, the channel is 500 feet or more in width and 45 feet in depth at normal lake level.

13. Gaillard Cut is an artificial extension of Gatun Lake through the Continental Divide, and the cut may be considered for present purposes as extending from Chagres River crossing, just south of Camboa, to Pedro Miguel locks, a distance of nearly 9 miles. In the cut the channels are of much more restricted widths than elsewhere in Gatun Lake, and the alignment includes more bends, but none as sharp as some in the Gatun Lake channel. The minimum bottom width of the channel in the cut is 300

feet, and the minimum depth, with Gatun Lake at elevation 85, its normal level, is 45 feet. The channels are somewhat wider at most of the bends and other critical places, so that for a considerable portion of the length of the cut widths greater than 300 feet prevail.

14. At Pedro Miguel there are 2 locks (2 flights, each of single lift) which give access from Gatun Lake to Miraflores Lake, the normal surface level of which is considered to be at elevation 54 (feet above mean sea level). The superficial area of Miraflores Lake is about 1.5 square miles. It serves to regulate the tributary streams but provides very limited anchorage for vessels. The spillway for Miraflores Lake, which is located to the eastward of Miraflores locks, has its crest at elevation 38.67 and 8 gates similar to those of the Gatun spillway.

15. From Pedro Miguel Locks the canal channel extends through Miraflores Lake 1 mile to Miraflores locks, which consist of 2 flights of 2 lifts each (4 locks). The lower (southern) locks at Miraflores are subject to a variation of some 10 feet in either direction from normal, depending upon the state of the tide, which has an extreme range of about 20 feet in the channel below the locks. From Miraflores locks to the Pacific entrance, 6 miles, the channel is at sea level.

Features of the third locks project

16. The principal purposes of the third locks project are to increase the capacity of the canal in respect to the size and number of vessels that may be accommodated and to decrease the probability of interruption of traffic by enemy action. The former is to be attained by the construction of locks of increased dimensions, viz, 1,200 feet long, 140 feet wide, and with a minimum depth of water of 45 feet, compared with 1,000 feet, 110 feet, and 40 feet, respectively, in the dimensions of the existing locks. The greater dimensions of the proposed locks will permit the passage of larger vessels, and the additional flight of locks to be provided throughout will increase the number of vessels that can transit the canal in a given period, since vessels can be dispatched through the channels at shorter intervals than through the locks. The probability of damage is to be decreased by certain features of the design, which it is unnecessary to describe here, and by locating the new locks at a distance from the existing locks beyond the probable pattern of bombs directed at the latter and beyond the most destructive effects of even larger explosions in the immediate vicinity of the existing locks.

17. At Gatun the third locks project contemplates locks in a single flight of three lifts, located approximately one-half mile to the eastward of the existing locks. The connecting channels to the new locks will be easy and direct.

18. At Pedro Miguel and at Miraflores the project contemplates location of the new locks about a quarter of a mile to the westward of the existing locks and in corresponding flights, a single lock opposite Pedro Miguel and a single flight of two lifts opposite Miraflores. Plate II shows the Pacific locks and channels of the third locks project and their relation to the existing locks and channels.

19. Topographical features and the requirements of reasonable economy in excavation necessitate a sharp bend in the north approach channel to the New Pedro Miguel lock and an easier bend at the intersection with the present channel. The angle, 46° 17', of the sharper bend is greater than that of any of the bends in the present channel, except in Gatun Lake, where there are 5 bends with angles from 48° 17' to 67° 12'. As to compensatory measures, the channel at this bend is to be 55 feet deep and 900 feet wide, which greatly exceed the channel depth and width in any part of Gaillard Cut. An-

other bend will be required between the Pedro Miguel and Miraflores locks of this project. This bend is located in Miraflores Lake, where maneuvering space is available.

20. A surge reservoir approximately 70 acres in area at Gatun Lake level is provided for in the third locks project. This reservoir is designed to prevent any increase, on account of the new lock, in the magnitude of the surges presently created in Gaillard Cut by operation of the existing locks at Pedro Miguel. With small additional expense the surge reservoir could be connected for use to dampen also the surges created by the existing locks.

Status of work on the third lock project

21. The initial construction program, which provided for the completion of the third locks project as early as practicable, was modified in compliance with instructions of the Secretary of War, in May 1942, to meet requirements of the national war program, and construction work has been suspended in respect to features which would require substantial amounts of materials needed for war purposes or would require much shipping capacity. In the modified program, the excavation required for the Gatun locks and for the Miraflores locks has been virtually completed. No excavation for the Pedro Miguel lock has been made and none is contemplated until the present program is changed. Construction of all locks has been deferred. Work on the sea-level approach channels at Gatun and Miraflores is being carried on with low priority. The relocation of utilities and other facilities required by the project has been practically completed. The plants for the production of concrete aggregates for all locks have been completed at Camboa and on the west side of the canal near Miraflores. Nearly all work done on this project could be utilized to advantage in any of the plans proposed in the references.

Plans suggested for further investigation

22. The plans suggested in the references are designated below by letters and brief descriptive titles. All plans, of course, include, in addition to the features stated, the removal of the existing Pedro Miguel locks and corresponding modifications in the third locks project.

A. Transform present Miraflores locks into three lifts by increasing the heights of present structures, adding a lower chamber at the south end of each flight and provide a three-lift flight at the new Miraflores site of the third locks project.

B. Transform present Miraflores locks into three lifts by adding an upper chamber at the north end of each flight and provide a three-lift flight at the new Miraflores site of the third locks project.

C. Abandon present Miraflores locks and construct 2 flights of 3 lifts each at the new Miraflores site of the third locks project.

D. Transform present Miraflores locks to 2-lift flights covering the full range from sea level to summit level and provide a 3-lift flight at the new Miraflores site of the third locks project.

E. Construct 2 3-lift flights at the new Miraflores site and subsequently a single flight of 3 lifts at the site of the existing Miraflores locks.

Plan A is shown on plate III, plan B on plate IV, and plan C on plate V.

23. Plans A, B, and C are those recommended for investigation in references (a) and (b), except that plan C as considered in this report has been modified by substituting 1 flight of large locks for the 2 flights of smaller locks suggested in the references. Subsequently, the captain of the port, Balboa, has recommended the abandonment of plan B on account of the reduction it requires in the area of the proposed anchorage. Plans D and E are those suggested by the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in reference (h). All the plans are essen-

tially the same in respect to their effects on important adjacent facilities, such as the towns of Pedro Miguel and Red Tank, the Panama Railroad, highways, and utilities, in the area that would be submerged in Miraflores Lake at the higher elevation proposed.

III. ADVANTAGES OF THE GENERAL PLAN PROPOSED

Statement of the advantages

24. Since all the plans suggested are merely different methods of attaining the primary objective, a basin of adequate size for anchorage and other purposes at the south end of Gaillard Cut, it is in order to consider the benefits to be derived if that were accomplished. The advantages stated in paragraph 39 of reference (a) and in paragraph 5 of reference (b) are restated below in a more logical order and with changes in form to consolidate the list by combining items of similar nature and to eliminate most of the overlapping and duplication, which appear in the references as a consequence of stating the results anticipated and the feature by which they would be accomplished as separate advantages. Two advantages suggested since the submission of the references are added to this list, but they are of little importance.

- (1) Provides an anchorage area at Gatun Lake level at the south end of Gaillard Cut;
- (2) Eliminates the channel bends in the approach channels to Pedro Miguel locks of the third locks project;
- (3) Reduces or eliminates surges in Gaillard Cut;
- (4) Reduces the annual operating costs of Pacific locks;
- (5) Reduces the time required for a vessel to transit the canal in an amount depending upon characteristics of the vessel;
- (6) Increases the convenience and safety of passing vessels through the canal.
- (7) Removes strong reasons presented for sea-level canal;
- (8) Increases the storage capacity of Gatun Lake;
- (9) Increases the watershed tributary to Gatun Lake;
- (10) Affords opportunity for development of hydroelectric power at Miraflores;
- (11) Eliminates silting at Pedro Miguel locks;
- (12) Permits abandonment of Paraiso mooring station;
- (13) Increases the spillway capacity of Gatun Lake;
- (14) Permits saving in railroad operation in the event of the abandonment of Pedro Miguel as a main station;
- (15) Eliminates surge waves in Miraflores Lake;
- (16) Reduces channel maintenance operations;
- (17) Permits better distribution of Dredging Division equipment in the event of slides.

In the following paragraphs of this section the nature and extent of the advantages listed above are explained and discussed sufficiently to give a general conception of their importance for comparison with disadvantages treated in the same manner in later sections.

Provides an anchorage area at Gatun Lake level at the south end of Gaillard Cut

25. The anchorage area at the south end of Gaillard Cut is the principal feature of the general plan proposed, and many of the advantages suggested in the references pertain to the use of the anchorage.

26. One of its main purposes is to lessen the effects of fog upon the capacity of the canal. Fogs of such density as to preclude navigation of the cut occur frequently during the rainy season from May to December. At such times, the lockage of vessels northbound at Pedro Miguel is impracticable because they cannot proceed immediately into the cut, and there are at present no adequate berthing or anchorage facilities above the

locks. Fog rarely covers the locks so as to interfere with their operation, and if berthing space on anchorage were available above the locks, ships could be locked up and held until the fog cleared in the cut, when they could be dispatched at close intervals. After the fog lifted, the anchorage could be cleared of vessels in readiness to receive southbound vessels. Meanwhile, northbound lockages could be continued as required, and if the anchorage space were sufficient and the fog did not persist too long, the capacity of the canal for the day as limited by the speed of lockage would remain unaffected by the fog. In the references, 10 minutes apart is the interval suggested for the dispatch of vessels through the cut which may be compared with intervals of about 55 minutes between lockages at each flight of locks. Of course, the delay to the first ship caused by the fog could not be lessened, but the following ships detained in the basin would experience successively shorter delays on that account.

27. Fogs may occur at any time, but they usually occur sometime between 9 p. m. and 8 a. m. They are rare in the dry season from January through April. During the rainy season, from May to December, they are intermittent and irregular, but not infrequent, and in the worst months, usually October and November, from 10 to 20 foggy nights may occur in a month. At Pedro Miguel locks, fogs are infrequent, even in the rainy season, and at Miraflores rarer still.

28. Largely because it has not yet been found necessary or desirable to operate the canal regularly at night between 11 p. m. and 7 a. m. (except during overhaul periods, in the dry season) detailed data on the density and duration of fogs in the cut are fragmentary. Good observations have been made for periods of a few weeks at a time, but complete continuous records over periods of years are not available. The data available are sufficient to show that dense fogs during which navigation of the cut would have to be suspended, although sometimes lasting 12 hours or more, usually begin late at night and disappear soon after sunrise. On the average they apparently last less than 8 hours of the nights on which they occur.

29. The theoretical capacity required in the anchorage would, therefore, be about one-third the maximum daily capacity of the Pacific locks, which may, with reasonable assumptions, be taken as about 60 ships for the existing canal and about 110 ships after the third flight of locks has been added. To compensate for the effects of fog as completely as possible by this means, an anchorage for 37 ships might be required. Incidentally, traffic reaching 110 ships on occasional peak days would correspond to a probable annual traffic of more than 20,000 vessels, which is not anticipated until the year 2055. Plate VI shows previous and present traffic predictions.

30. All the plans provide an anchorage of approximately the indicated capacity, except plan B, in which the capacity is reduced about 15 percent below that of the anchorage provided in the other plans. That reduction should not be regarded as very serious in view of the approximate method used in estimating the maximum capacity needed, the remoteness of the time when the full 24-hour capacity of the locks may be required frequently, the possibilities of enlarging the anchorage area by dredging if and when required, and especially the limitation of the capacity of the locks imposed by overhaul requirements, which cannot be affected materially by the anchorage basin.

31. The existing locks require extensive overhaul at intervals of about 4 years. On account of the large amounts of bituminous enamel to be applied and of the need for prosecuting the work as rapidly as possible, both of which would be interfered with by rain, the overhauls are carried out during the dry season. A considerable additional

force of mechanics and other workers has to be obtained, housed and cared for temporarily for this work, and it has been found most desirable to overhaul all of the Pacific locks in one dry season and all of the Atlantic locks during the second dry season following, so that the locks at one end of the Canal or the other are under overhaul every second dry season. During most of the overhaul period, one flight of locks cannot be used and the capacity of the other flight of the existing locks may be reduced from 15 to 30 percent by the necessity of using only the sidewall culverts, instead of both sidewall and centerwall culverts, for filling and emptying the locks. As a result, the maximum capacity is reduced for a period of 2 or 3 months during the overhaul to about 24 lockages, or 30 to 36 ships per day, and with the additional third locks the capacity would be about 80 ships. In the dry season of the year, fogs are so infrequent that their effects upon Canal traffic are slight. When they do occur, the anchorage area could be used to advantage and would increase the capacity of the Canal for the day.

32. Since the ruling capacity of the existing locks, which is established by the requirements of overhauling the locks, occurs in the dry season, the minimum capacity of the Canal is not materially affected by fogs. The same will be true after the addition of a third set of locks.

33. With the third set of locks in operation, their combined capacity will be about 1 ship every 13 minutes. If, as previously indicated, the interval at which ships may be dispatched through the cut is 10 minutes, the capacity of the locks will be 75 percent of the capacity of the cut for one-way traffic, which is required as a safety measure for vessels of large size or other very unfavorable characteristics. It is practicable to provide mooring facilities for a limited number of vessels above the present and proposed locks at Pedro Miguel and so to obtain some of the advantages of the proposed anchorage at nominal cost.

34. This discussion suggests that anchorage for a large number of vessels is of less importance than widening the cut to permit two-way traffic for all vessels. It is practicable to widen Gaillard Cut at a cost which has been estimated tentatively at about \$70 million, for a minimum width of 500 feet. The wider channel would be beneficial in reducing surges, decreasing the probability of accident in the cut, avoiding delays to individual vessels, simplifying dispatching, and would offer other advantages similar or comparable to those of the anchorage.

35. It is apparent that some of the advantages of the anchorage basin suggested in the reference depend upon the operation of the locks 24 hours daily. There are practical advantages in the 16-hour operation which has been the rule since the opening of the canal 29 years ago. The cost of 16-hour operation is much less than that of 24-hour operation. The night hours in which operation is suspended can be utilized when necessary for running repairs and similar work that cannot well be carried on when the lock machinery is actually in use. With regular operation for 16 hours, it is possible to compensate for time lost in any extraordinary circumstances and to take care of exceptional peak traffic by overtime operation extending into the third shift. At such times, the anchorage might be very useful in reducing the effects of fog as previously indicated. However, after the addition of the third flight the capacity of the locks will be so large in comparison with the traffic in prospect that regular 24-hour operation during the rainy season in which fog occurs will not be necessary for many years to come. If the ultimate growth of traffic taxes the capacity of the 3 flights of locks, the limitation on the lockage capacity which is established during the overhaul period

may be expected to necessitate the provision of additional locks before 24-hour operation in the rainy season would be required.

36. The prospect that technical means may soon be developed to permit the safe navigation of the cut in fog, especially if the channel should be widened to 500 feet or more, is not considered to be sufficiently definite to warrant more than mention.

37. The proposed anchorage offers very desirable operational advantages and would permit reduction in delays up to 8 hours in individual cases, which a moderate proportion of the transiting vessels might otherwise encounter from time to time. It does not appear, however, that the ruling capacity or the useful life of the canal would be materially affected, as suggested in the references.

38. Other advantages are attributed in the references to the anchorage, but they are of relatively slight importance or doubtful validity and may be considered as included under item 6, explained in paragraphs 56-69.

Eliminates the channel bends in the approach channels to Pedro Miguel locks of the third locks project

39. There are 3 bends in these approach channels, 1 in the south approach and 2 in the north approach. The bend in the south approach with an angle of 37° 20' is in Miraflores Lake where the maneuvering space is sufficient to make this bend unobjectionable, or at least not seriously objectionable. The two bends in the north approach are in a more restricted channel and their elimination would be an advantage. The sharper of the two bends, 46° 17', is about 3,000 feet to the northward of the lock. To reduce the difficulty of making this turn, the channel width has been established at 900 feet, which is believed to be sufficient for the largest vessels that could pass through the proposed locks to make the turn without serious difficulty. The depth of the approach channel has been established 10 feet greater than the depth of the existing channels in Gaillard Cut, which will decrease the difficulty of handling large vessels in the sharper bend as well as in the straight reaches of the channel. The increased width and depth will reduce the "suction" effects that would be experienced with large vessels in channels of smaller dimensions.

40. The other bend occurs at the intersection of this approach channel and the existing channel of the canal, about 9,000 feet northward from both the existing and the proposed Pedro Miguel locks. The angle at this bend is 28° 59' and the width of the proposed channel is 500 feet. Careful study has been given to the possibility of dangerous currents near the intersection of the two channels, which might be induced by surges in either or both of the channels. Hydraulic model tests show that such currents will not be serious. The surge reservoir of the third locks project will reduce the surges that might otherwise result from the operation of the new Pedro Miguel lock and can also be connected at small expense and used to reduce those created by the existing locks.

41. Large vessels require tugs to assist them in the smaller channels of Gaillard Cut and that assistance would continue also in the new channel, to reduce or avoid difficulties that might otherwise be experienced in navigating these two bends. Notwithstanding the precautions taken in the design of the project, the two bends decrease the speed with which large vessels can navigate the channel and tend to increase the probability of accident. The possible effects of the bends and the benefit that would be derived from their elimination are difficult to evaluate accurately. The records of accidents probably afford the best basis for appraisal of the advantage of eliminating bends in the channel, and a special analysis has been made of the records of grounding in Gaillard Cut to

determine any relationship that may be disclosed between the angles of the bends and the groundings that have occurred in their vicinity.

42. There are nine bends with angles from 7° 37' to 29° 59' in the cut. In the following table, the bends are designated by name and arranged in the order of the size of the angles. The total number of groundings near the bend, the number attributed en-

tirely to the bend, the number attributed in part to the bend, and the percentage of the total number of groundings that were attributed at least partly to the bend, are shown. With due allowance for the haphazard occurrence of accidents, the total groundings attributed in some measure to a particular bend would be expected to reflect its relative hazard, even if the total number of groundings in the vicinity did not.

Name of bend	Angle	Groundings				
		Total	Entirely due to bend	Partly due to bend	Total due to bend	Percent due to bend
Bas Obispo.....	29 59	17	6	4	10	59
Cunette (La Pita).....	29 25	15	10	2	12	80
Lirio.....	22 14	20	12	2	14	70
Santa Cruz.....	21 58	8	2	1	3	37
Culebra.....	17 43	26	10	6	16	62
Paraiso.....	14 36	17	2	3	5	29
Cartagena.....	10 28	11	3	4	7	64
Las Cascadas.....	9 9	15	4	4	8	53
Empire.....	7 37	15	10	2	12	80
Total.....		144	59	28	87	60

¹ Average.

Of the 9 bends, the sharpest stand tied with 1 other for third place in total number of accidents, fifth in the number attributed entirely to the bend, tied with 2 others for second in the number attributed partly to the bend, and fifth in the total number of groundings attributed wholly or in part to the bend. The smallest bend of the 9 stands tied with 2 others for fifth place in total groundings, is tied with 2 others for second in those attributed entirely to the bend, tied with 2 others for sixth in those partly attributed to the bend and tied with 1 other for third in the total number attributable to the bend.

43. These and other similar comparisons which can be made are interpreted not as showing that large bends are no more objectionable than small ones, but merely that the angle of the bend and the accidents likely to occur in it do not show a pronounced relationship in the statistical analysis of 144 cases. Statistically, the most dangerous of the bends is Culebra with an angle which is a little more than half that of Bas Obispo and more than double that of Empire. The channel width is only 350 feet at Culebra and it is the sharpest of the 3 bends in which the channel width is 350 feet or less at the bend. Comparisons of the same kind, based on channel widths at the bends, are as patternless as those in the table above.

44. In the bend in the north approach to the proposed Pedro Miguel lock, the channel width is 900 feet, compared with 650 feet at Bas Obispo, 520 feet at Cunette, and 350 feet at Culebra. The depth is 10 feet greater than the depth in Gaillard Cut. Practical limitations do not permit an increase in the 900-foot width even if it were considered to be badly needed, but the remainder of the approach channel could be widened to a width of 500 feet throughout at a cost of about \$9 million.

45. The sharpest bend in the Suez Canal is 48° 08'; the channel width at the water level is 512 feet, but only 256 feet at the bottom. The depth is about 2 feet less than that of Gaillard Cut. The banks of the channel in the Suez Canal are generally sandy and consequently grounding is less serious than in the Panama Canal where the banks are generally of rock.

46. There appears little room for doubt that experienced pilots would be able to navigate the bends in the widened approach channel to the Pedro Miguel lock without much, if any, greater danger or difficulty than that now experienced in the narrow channel at the Culebra bend.

47. Ships using the approach channel would avoid the Paraiso and Cartagena bends of the present channel.

Reduces or eliminates surges in Gaillard Cut

48. An increase in the usable water-storage capacity of Gatun Lake would result from any reduction in the size of the surges, which may occur in Gaillard Cut as a result of drawing water for lockages. These surge waves alternately lower and raise the surface elevation at Pedro Miguel and in the cut. They decrease the range in which it would otherwise be practicable to manipulate the lake level without decreasing the navigable depths of the channel in the cut insupportably on the one hand, or risking the flooding of the machinery chambers of the Pedro Miguel locks on the other hand. The creation of any considerable surge basin at the south end of Gaillard Cut would decrease the range of the surges, and a basin of the size proposed in the general plan would reduce the surge to insignificant proportions. It is also practicable to avoid the surges to a very large extent by regulating the time and the rate at which water is drawn for lockage, but not without affecting the rate at which vessels may be locked through. Under certain conditions the surges may be as much as 1.5 feet above or below the mean level of the lake, and their elimination would permit the effective use of about 150,000 acre-feet of the storage capacity of Gatun Lake which it is not now practicable to use. This additional storage is not a necessity for navigation under present conditions, since the completion of Madden Lake. It may be needed, however, in the distant future under conditions of high traffic density and low runoff from the watersheds of the two lakes.

49. The use of the additional storage would be of considerable immediate value as a means of increasing hydroelectric power production during the dry season. The economic value of this power storage has not yet been estimated accurately, nor have the costs of providing equivalent storage by other means been determined.

50. The requirements of water for lockages and the maintenance of navigable depths in the channel in Gatun Lake conflict in principle with the use of this storage for power development. With the future growth of traffic, the portion of the storage which it may be permissible to use for power purposes will decline. This conflict does not exist in respect to storage above and tributary to Gatun Lake, as in Madden Lake. Consequently, the storage of greatest continuing value for power and navigation purposes is

supplementary storage above the level of Gatun Lake, and preferably above Madden Lake, so that the regulated flow could be utilized also for power development at Madden Dam, where the head is nearly twice that at Gatun.

51. In addition to the desirable effects upon the limiting lake levels that the elimination of surges would produce, it would be beneficial in the reduction of currents in the cut unfavorable to navigation. As shown in paragraph 60 the damage from all accidents to vessels in the canal has been relatively small. The intangible advantages of decreasing the difficulty and the danger of navigation are in the reduction of the strain on the pilots and in the possibility that a more serious accident than has ever occurred might happen and close the channel in whole or in part for a considerable period at a critical time. The probability of such an accident can be estimated only from past experience, which indicates that the probability is not great. The consequences in time of war, however, might be of almost any magnitude, and an improvement that would decrease the probability of accident merits consideration, even though its value is not susceptible of accurate appraisal.

Reduces the annual operating cost of the Pacific locks

52. This is a definite economic advantage inherent in any plan for concentrating the locks at a single location. The probable magnitude of the economic benefit varies among the several plans. The normal operating cost of the existing locks at Pedro Miguel and Miraflores, including prorated costs of the overhauls, is approximately \$1,150,000 per year. The corresponding costs after the completion of the third locks are estimated at \$1,460,000. Substantially similar plans of operation would be applicable to plans A or B, and the annual operating cost is estimated at \$940,000. The operating costs of plan C would be in the neighborhood of \$700,000 per year, and of plans D or E, \$1 million per year.

Reduces the time required for a vessel to transit the canal

53. A reduction in the total time required for a vessel to transit the canal would result from the elimination of the Pedro Miguel locks and the avoidance of the delay incurred in approaching those locks, attaching the lines of the towing locomotives, and departing from the locks after lockage. The saving in time that might be expected is stated in reference (a) as about 1 hour. That estimate indicates the general magnitude of the saving of time on this account, although the actual savings of time would vary considerably with the characteristics of individual vessels and the circumstances of each transit. The average would probably be closer to one-half hour.

54. The elimination of such delays is of tangible value to each vessel and the total economic value of the improvement would increase in proportion to the total traffic. Estimating liberally the average value of the saving in time at \$75 per vessel, the economic benefit would range from \$470,000 annually, for the year of highest traffic to date, to about \$1,500,000, for the traffic to be anticipated in the year 2055.

55. Theoretically, it should be possible to recover a large part of such savings to commercial vessels by increasing the canal tolls and so to obtain an increase in the revenues of the canal enterprises. Practically, however, it has not been possible to establish the tolls as high as the operating expense of the canal and a fair return on the capital investment require. It is therefore problematical what proportion, if any, of the economic benefit of reducing the time of transit of commercial vessels might accrue to the United States. In normal times, vessels operated by or for the account of the United States constitute less than 7 per-

cent of the total traffic, and the direct benefit to the Government of a reduction in the time of transit would be correspondingly small. About 60 percent of the traffic in normal times is comprised of vessels of foreign countries, and the remainder of commercial vessels flying the American flag.

Increases the convenience and safety of passing vessels through the canal

56. This benefit, as it is stated above, combines a number of advantages of similar general nature stated separately in the references. The convenience of passing vessels is intended to cover the simplification of dispatching traffic, the reduction of mental and physical strain on pilots, the decrease in the need for assistance by tugs, and general benefits of like nature, which the anchorage basin and the elimination of the separate Pedro Miguel locks would afford. These advantages are real but generally intangible, so that it is difficult to appraise them, but they should not be disregarded on that account. Their importance increases with increases in the volume of traffic and so will be somewhat greater in future years than in the past. As a whole, advantages of this kind should not be regarded as of controlling importance in view of the success attained in operating the canal for nearly 30 years without them.

57. The more important advantages are those which increase the safety of transiting vessels. To a large extent, but by no means completely, advantages of this nature are included in other advantages that are stated more particularly elsewhere in this report. The improvement of navigation in the cut by the reduction of the surges, and the general desirability of avoiding bends, especially in narrow channels, have already been explained.

58. Another contributory cause of accidents exists at the approaches to the locks, and the elimination of the separate locks at Pedro Miguel may be expected to reduce the accidents experienced in approaching and departing from locks by about one-third, or possibly a little more, since the northerly approach to both the existing Pedro Miguel locks and that of the third locks project may be regarded as more difficult than the other approaches to locks. The data in paragraph 16 of reference (a) suggest that the probability of accident in approaching or leaving the Pedro Miguel locks is 10 percent greater than at Gatun and 60 percent greater than at Miraflores.

59. A study has been made of the records of the accidents that have occurred in the channels of the canal since it has been in operation, excluding accidents in the terminal harbors. Plate VII shows graphically some of the results of this study.

60. The records are not complete in all respects, but they are sufficient to show the general nature and magnitude of the problem of accidents. The following figures are taken from the report of the study:

Total number of accidents (excluding accidents in terminal harbors)	708
Average number of accidents per year	25
Total number of transits of the canal	130,350
Average number of transits per accident	184
Number of accidents per thousand transits	5.4

The records give estimates of the damage in 505 of the 708 accidents. In the remainder, the damage was possibly not in every case insignificant, but in serious accidents an investigation by the board of local inspectors is necessary to fix the responsibility. The investigation may be omitted when a vessel concerned is unwilling to be delayed sufficiently to permit the investigation to be made. In general, it may be assumed that the damage was very small and may be

ignored in those cases in which no estimate of the damage has been made. The following data are summarized from the records of 505 accidents in which estimates of damage were made:

Total estimated damage	\$1,078,000
Average damage per accident	2,100
Average damage actually estimated per year	38,500
Average damage per year for all accidents, calculated at average damage for 505	54,000

61. The records of accidents have also been analyzed in respect to the type or cause of accidents, with the following results which are pertinent to this consideration:

Type of accident	Number of accidents	Percent of total	Average damage per accident
Striking lock wall	312	44	\$820
Grounding	184	26	3,500
Collision	62	9	3,600
All other	150	21	300
Total	708	100

62. It should be recognized, of course, that a number of the extensions of these estimates are subject to question, that losses of time to vessels are not included in the damage estimates, and consequently, that the figures given are not highly accurate. However, they furnish good evidence that the problem of accidents is not a major one. It is significant also that the accident rate shows a distinct downward trend.

63. It may be seen from plate VII that the most recent 5-year average of damage to vessels entering or leaving Pedro Miguel locks amounts to about 30 cents per vessel transiting the canal.

64. Naval vessels are mentioned separately here because of the special concern for their safety, which under certain circumstances may be of another order of importance than economic value, and because in the references mention is made of the special importance to naval vessels of the improvements suggested. In general, it appears that the advantages of the proposed plan would accrue to naval vessels in about the same measure as to vessels of other types. The essential difference is that the certainty, time and safety of the transit of the canal by naval vessels in war may be of much greater importance than for merchant vessels at any time, and scarcely practicable of evaluation by any standard or method. Considerations of that kind have constituted the justification for the separation of the locks of the third locks project from the existing locks and from each other. The separation decreases the probability of the complete closure of the canal, as a result of bombing and some other kinds of attack, quite sufficiently, it is believed, to warrant the expense of the necessary approach channels to the new locks and the other disadvantages they entail. Except for this requirement, the alignment of those channels could readily have been adjusted to meet practically any standards desired. The location of the new locks in a single three-lift flight at the new Miraflores site was considered in the design of the third locks project. That plan offered substantial savings in cost and straight approach channels. The separation of the locks of the third flight, as they appear in the third locks project, was decided upon to decrease the probability of closure of the canal through enemy action.

65. If all three of the proposed locks were located in a single flight they would offer a single target in which all of the locks would lie within the probable pattern of bombs directed at the middle lock and within the destructive area of a large explosion in that lock. The series of three locks would

conform well to the normal pattern of torpedo bombing or other low-level attack by planes following the center line of the locks.

66. In addition to separating the three locks of the flight, advantage was taken of the existence of Miraflores Lake further to decrease the probability of the complete closure of the canal through damage to the Pacific locks. The connecting channel between the Pedro Miguel and the Miraflores locks of the third flight was projected through Miraflores Lake instead of directly between the locks and to the westward of the lake. In this arrangement, a vessel after passing through one of the 3 lower flights can be routed through any of the 3 locks at Pedro Miguel. Complete closure of the canal by damage to these locks would require damage to all of the upper locks or to at least 1 lock in each of the 3 lower flights, a combination much less probable than damage to any 3 locks in different flights, which would close the canal if the locks were continuous in each flight. The results of the destruction of the gates of an upper lock would also be much less serious and extensive with the locks separated in flight than if the locks of each flight were together. Miraflores Lake, with its separate spillway, should protect the lower locks from damage by the overflow from above.

67. One other observation in respect to the use of the anchorage basin in war time to reduce delay on account of fog, seems appropriate. Mitigation of the effects of fog would require the concentration in the anchorage basin of the vessels locked through to the upper level during the fog period and their detention until the fog lifted, usually after daylight. This would be a disposition very vulnerable to attack by aircraft and unfavorable in respect to any damage, such as the destruction of lock or spillway gates, which might rapidly lower the level of Gatun Lake. Under circumstances in which either of these possibilities was conceived to exist, war vessels, at least, would probably not be exposed to such risks for the sake of time to be saved in transiting the canal.

68. These considerations are real but not susceptible of evaluation with accuracy. Their merits are matters of judgment and there is room for considerable difference of opinion concerning them, but the third locks project is safer in respect to damage by enemy attack than any of the other plans.

69. In paragraphs 59-61 it is shown that the probability of damage by accidents in normal times and the magnitude of the total damage experienced are relatively small.

Removes strong reasons presented for sea-level canal

70. This item has been restated here only because it has been advanced, in reference (a), as one of the advantages of the proposed plan. It is believed that any change, however beneficial, in the high level canal, would have little influence on either the uninformed or the well-informed advocates of a sea-level canal. It is possible that advocates of a sea-level canal would oppose unjustifiably any expensive change in present plans on the grounds that it would defer the time when the conversion of the existing canal to a sea-level waterway might otherwise be authorized. Some opposition of that kind was in evidence when the legislation to authorize the third locks project was under consideration, but the opposition subsided when it was pointed out that a third set of locks would be a practical necessity in lowering the levels of Gatun Lake without prolonged interruption of traffic.

71. Although the wisdom of the adoption of the high-level plan in the original construction of the canal is completely established, there remain advocates of the eventual substitution of a sea-level canal who can hardly be dismissed as uninformed or incompetent. The main arguments for a

canal at sea level are not in the superiority of its navigational features. On the contrary, the provision of channels as safe and easy to navigate as those of the existing canal would involve heavy costs, while narrow and crooked channels would be slower, more difficult, and more dangerous for ships to pass through, than the channels and locks of the canal as they exist today.

72. The arguments for a sea-level canal are based upon the relative vulnerability of the lock canal and a sea-level canal to damage by enemy attack. In that respect a sea-level canal is superior to a high-level lock canal, although at this location a sea-level canal would involve dams, for the regulation and diversion of tributary streams, and probably tidal locks, which could be damaged or destroyed by bombing. The principal advantages of the sea-level canal would be that its structures would be more difficult to destroy or damage seriously and that the results of such damage would be less grave and far-reaching than like damage to the structures of a high-level lock canal. Destruction of the locks or dams of the high-level canal, resulting in the loss of water from the summit lake, would prevent resumption of traffic until repairs could be made and the lake refilled thereafter. To fill Gatun Lake, if it were entirely empty, might require a year or more under unfavorable conditions.

73. The use of the locks of a sea-level canal for lockage would probably not be required for the transit of vessels at favorable daily stages of tide, and the locks being of low head could be readily repaired, by improvised arrangements if necessary, after damage of any kind, more quickly than high-lift locks. Upon the completion of repairs, traffic could be resumed without delay to await restoration of lake levels. The diversion dams of a sea-level canal, although not invulnerable, would be much less vulnerable than locks. The existing dams at Pedro Miguel and Miraflores, for example, are hardly considered as elements of weakness at all, nor are the dams that would be required to raise the elevation of Miraflores Lake to elevation 85. Gatun Dam has been regarded as involving more definite danger, because of its greater size. Any substantial channel permitting water to flow through the dam would probably result in the disintegration of a large section of the earth and rock fill, and the consequent loss of a large part of the water of the lake, before remedial measures could be taken effectively. The large cross section of the Gatun Dam and the difficulty and improbability of creating a continuous breach through it by bombing greatly decrease the hazards, and the same would be true of the principal diversion dams of a sea-level canal.

74. A sea-level canal would have a greater proportion of its length in relatively narrow channels than the present canal, and would be correspondingly more liable to interruption through the sinking of vessels, by either enemy action or accident. However, the minimum channel widths heretofore considered in the discussion of the possibilities of a sea-level canal have been 500 feet, compared with 300 feet in Gaillard Cut, and the former would be less likely to be closed completely by a sunken vessel.

75. These brief comments, and in fact all of the data available, are insufficient to dispose of many important questions pertinent to this subject. They point, however, to the conclusion that the plans under consideration in this report would have little effect upon either the merits or the discussion of the sea-level canal.

Increases the storage capacity of Gatun Lake

76. The increase in the storage capacity of Gatun Lake by the inclusion of the proposed basin is estimated roughly as about 2 percent. This increase of some 10,000 acre-feet in the useful storage capacity is a

tangible advantage, but it is relatively small in magnitude and is dwarfed by the increase in useful storage capacity to be obtained by the reduction of the surges, designated (3) in paragraph 24 and described in paragraphs 48-51.

Increases the watershed tributary to Gatun Lake

77. The increase in the area of the watershed of Gatun Lake by the inclusion of 37.4 square miles now tributary to Miraflores Lake amounts to about 2.8 percent, and is slightly greater than the proportionate increase in the storage capacity of the lake. In view of the high yield of the Gatun Lake watershed compared with the storage available, the increase in the watershed area is of little practical consequence.

Affords opportunity for development of hydroelectric power at Miraflores

78. The same total head exists at Pedro Miguel and at Miraflores that would be available if the Pacific locks were concentrated at the latter location, but the division of the total head into two separate parts would increase the cost of utilizing it for the development of hydroelectric power. Since the entire head is now available at Gatun, where the powerhouse, with provision for the future expansion of its generating capacity, has already been provided and is connected to the Pacific side through the transmission lines of the Canal Zone power system the only advantage to be derived from the development of power at the Pacific locks would be in the dispersion of the powerplants.

Eliminates silting at Pedro Miguel locks

79. This is an advantage that would accrue from the execution of any of the plans proposed. The magnitude of the benefit is small.

Permits abandonment of Paraiso mooring station

80. This advantage would also accrue from any of the plans, but it is considered to be insignificant.

Increases the spillway capacity of Gatun Lake

81. Additional spillway capacity would be a substantial benefit to Gatun Lake in that with ample spillway capacity to take care of unexpected floods near the end of the rainy season, it would be permissible to raise the lake to a somewhat higher level than would otherwise be possible without incurring risk of flooding the machinery of the locks in an unusual flood.

82. The elimination of the Pedro Miguel locks would eliminate the necessity for the spillway at Miraflores, since Miraflores Lake at the higher level could be regulated with Gatun Lake and by the same means. As stated above, additional spillway capacity for Gatun Lake is desirable and should eventually be provided, whether at Miraflores or elsewhere. Miraflores is not a desirable location for the additional spillway, since its discharge would enter the sea level channel a short distance below the Miraflores locks. When the present Miraflores spillway is in operation objectionable currents are created in the navigable channel and the cost of its maintenance is increased somewhat by such currents. These effects would be aggravated greatly by the use of a spillway at Miraflores for the regulation of Gatun Lake.

83. The need for additional spillway capacity has not yet been regarded as sufficiently urgent to warrant detailed study of the problem, which is independent of the plans under consideration, except that they provide a location at Miraflores not otherwise available, and a spillway of the desired capacity could be constructed as a feature of these plans at less cost, no doubt, than in any other way. It is probable that the most desirable location for additional spillway capacity would be found at one of the low

points on the northern rim of Gatun Lake, where the discharge would follow natural watercourses to the Caribbean Sea.

84. In any event the benefit of the additional spillway capacity contemplated by the proposed plans is of the same nature as the addition to the usable storage by the reduction of surges and is much smaller in magnitude.

Permits saving in railroad operation in the event of the abandonment of Pedro Miguel as a main station

85. Pedro Miguel station is unfavorably located for a main stop, because it is on a grade and at the end of a curve. The abandonment of this station would probably be possible, depending upon the detailed plans developed for the replacement of facilities which would have to be removed or abandoned to permit the enlargement of Miraflores Lake. It appears that the additional expense of operating the longer line of the railroad likely to be required in its relocation to conform to the higher lake level would be greater than the saving that might result from the abandonment of the Pedro Miguel stop. In the present stage of these investigations it is impossible to determine whether or not advantage could be realized on this account.

Eliminates surge waves in Miraflores Lake

86. Surges of measurable magnitude in Miraflores Lake may occur as a result of operation of the locks at either end of the lake or the Miraflores spillway. These surges are of little practical importance.

Reduces channel maintenance operations

87. The greater depths and width which would be established in the channel in Miraflores Lake would decrease the cost of maintaining the channel, which is approximately 1 mile in length. Less frequent use of Miraflores spillway, to be expected if Miraflores Lake were subject to normal regulation by the Gatun spillway, might decrease somewhat the amount of dredging in the channel below the present Miraflores locks. The magnitude and value of these influences would be small.

Permits better distribution of dredging division equipment in event of slides

88. In the operation of dredging equipment and other floating plant of the canal, the proposed anchorage basin would be a convenience of the same order as in the navigation of the canal channel by transiting vessels. The benefit would be of increased importance in the event of serious slides in Gaillard Cut. Slides are decreasing progressively in size and frequency and little advantage on this account would be obtained from the anchorage basin.

IV. DISADVANTAGES OF THE GENERAL PLAN PROPOSED

89. The brief review which has been given of the prospective benefits offered by the plans suggested, although incomplete and in some instances lacking even the reasonably precise data which it may be possible to obtain inexpensively in the course of further investigation, is sufficient to show that the overall benefits would be substantial and that physical factors are not unfavorable to the essential features of the general plan. The disadvantages common in considerable measure to all of these plans are found principally in the time and expense that would be required for their execution and the possibilities of damage by enemy action.

90. The necessity for the relocation of the towns of Pedro Miguel and Red Tank, sections of the Panama Railroad, highways, electric-power lines, water lines, and for miscellaneous other replacements and remedial works, is not discussed as a separate disadvantage, because this feature is evaluated satisfactorily by the rough estimates of the costs amounting to \$14 million, which are

included in the probable cost suggested for each plan.

Time required for completion

91. More time would be required to carry out any of those plans than to complete the third locks project. The importance of this disadvantage depends principally upon the international situation at the time construction at full rate is resumed on the project. When construction work began on the third locks project, July 1, 1940, it was expected that the larger locks would be required for the use of large naval vessels which would be ready to transit the canal before the new locks could possibly be completed. It was therefore of great urgency that the project be constructed in the shortest possible time, and the construction program was established to accomplish that purpose, at the expense of considerable savings offered by a somewhat longer period of construction. This program was subsequently modified to meet other requirements of the war, so that construction work is now virtually suspended. If the resumption of construction work should be postponed until after the war, it may then be a matter of small import whether or not the largest naval vessels are unable to transit the canal for a few years longer. In those circumstances, an extension of the time required for the completion of the project would not be a very serious disadvantage. The requirements of commercial shipping, as far as they can be foreseen, do not demand the completion of the new locks within the next 10 years. The importance of time is therefore largely for appraisal in the light of circumstances anticipated at the time construction is to be resumed.

92. The completion of the adopted third locks project is estimated to require about 5 years after the resumption of work, for construction at the most economical rate of progress and without shortage of men and materials. These are the conditions to be expected after the war. Under such conditions, the time required could probably be reduced about 1 year with some increase in cost, if it were determined to be desirable to incur it. Completion of the project in less than 4 years would hardly be practicable, even with easy markets for the equipment, material, and personnel required.

93. Estimates of the time required for the other plans, comparable in accuracy to the estimates for the third locks project, have not yet been made, but the following approximations appear to be close enough for present purposes.

(a) The single flight of three lifts proposed in plans A, B, and D at the site of the new Miraflores locks could be constructed in approximately the same time as that required for the completion of the third locks project. The transformation of the present Miraflores locks, if practicable, would probably require 2 years longer under favorable conditions. The work on the existing locks themselves could not be undertaken until the new flight was completed and in operation, although preparatory work and work on features other than the locks, such as the dams and spillway, could be carried on in the meantime. Consequently, the total time required for the execution of any one of these three plans would be in the neighborhood of 7 years. It would be practicable to shorten the construction period to 6 years at an increase in cost. Incidentally, while the reconstruction of the existing Miraflores locks was in progress there would be only the new flight available for use. Any accident which would render one of its locks inoperable would close the canal to traffic until the damage was repaired. For a large part of the construction period, it would be impossible to restore either of the old flights at Miraflores to operating condition, which is the action relied upon in case of such an accident when only one flight is in service during overhaul under existing conditions.

(b) The two triple flights of plan C at the new Miraflores site could be constructed in 6½ years at an economical rate and in 5½ years at additional cost. The construction of the additional flight at the site of the existing Miraflores locks, as proposed in plan E, would add about 1½ years to the construction period for plan C. These plans avoid the disadvantages of having only one flight available for an extended period during construction.

(c) The estimates are summarized as follows:

Time required to complete the several plans

	At the maximum rate	At the economical rate
	Years	Years
Third locks project.....	4	5
Plan A.....	6	7
Plan B.....	6	7
Plan C.....	5½	6½
Plan D.....	6	7
Plan E.....	7	8

Expense

94. Detailed estimates are available only of the costs of completing the Third Locks project. Consequently, there is as yet no entirely satisfactory basis for comparisons of its cost with those of the other plans, nor of the probable costs of the different plans with each other. Plan B, if it is practicable, is regarded as the cheapest of the five plans suggested in the references, and attention has been devoted chiefly to this plan in the investigations that have been made to date. A tentative general design and estimate of cost have been made for plan B, but the validity of the estimates depends upon the adequacy of the design to compensate the unfavorable foundation conditions. Consequently, the figures for plan B should be taken as about the minimum costs likely to be incurred in constructing it, and the probable costs of the other plans given below should be regarded only as rough appraisals for the purpose of general comparison of the cost features of the different plans.

Plans:	Probable cost to complete
Third locks project (Pacific side)	\$180,000,000
Plan A.....	290,000,000
Plan B.....	210,000,000
Plan C.....	280,000,000
Plan D.....	290,000,000
Plan E.....	360,000,000

¹ Probable cost if tentative general designs are sufficient to overcome unfavorable foundation conditions.

Damage by enemy action

95. The design of the third locks project was influenced basically by the purpose of making it as difficult as possible for an enemy to inflict serious damage, and of lessening the consequences of damage if it occurred. It was considered especially desirable to decrease the probability of closure of the canal for a long period of time. Unusual features are included in the design of the locks and appurtenant structures of the project to make them resistant to damage by bombing and to facilitate their repair after damage. These features would, of course, be included with equal effectiveness in the similar structures of any of the plans under consideration. However, the same purpose governed the locations selected for the locks of the project, and the locations suggested in all the other plans serve that purpose less effectively. The separation of the locks in flight would be sacrificed in all the other plans. One of them, plan C, would also give up the separation of corresponding locks in the different flights; the other plans would not.

96. The interchangeability of use between the Pedro Miguel locks and the Miraflores flights of locks afforded by the existing canal and by the third locks project, and the resulting decrease in the probability of complete closure of the canal by damage to locks, has previously been referred to. Any one of the Pedro Miguel locks may be used by any vessel (except one too large for the existing locks) which transits 1 of the 2-lift flights at Miraflores. Experience has demonstrated the operational advantage of this flexibility, and the lack of it in 3-lift flights increases the probability of the closure of all routes through the locks as a consequence of simultaneous damage to 3 or more. It is probably sufficient merely to state this relative disadvantage. Its importance, either in normal times or in war, can be judged only generally, like many of the other considerations mentioned in this report.

V. PARTICULAR DISADVANTAGES OF THE DIFFERENT PLANS

Plan A

97. This plan would require the construction of three lifts of the third locks at the new Miraflores site and the construction of 2 3-lift flights at the existing Miraflores locks by raising them to the required height and adding a third chamber at the south end of each flight. The transformation of the four existing locks at Miraflores to meet the requirements of this plan would amount almost to complete reconstruction. The dams and the spillway at Miraflores would be raised correspondingly, and the existing Pedro Miguel locks would be removed.

98. In addition to the disadvantages common to all the plans, a rather extensive modification of the channel to the south of the present locks would be necessary; and the unfavorable effects of currents in the south approach to the locks caused by the Cardenas River would be aggravated by the decrease in the distance between the mouth of the river and the entrance to the locks.

99. The practicability of the plan depends upon the possibilities of raising the lock walls, sills, gates, and machinery of the existing locks some 35 feet and of building the additional locks required. The foundations on which the existing locks rest may be sufficient to meet these greater requirements, but the walls themselves are not, and raising the existing locks would closely approach in difficulty and cost the building of new structures. The economies that it might be possible to realize would be chiefly in the use of the present gates and machinery, which would be of doubtful wisdom on account of their age and their probable condition after removal from their settings. Core borings are being made to develop the foundation conditions that would be encountered in constructing locks at the south end of the existing Miraflores locks. While these borings have not progressed sufficiently to support definite conclusions, the information presently available is favorable. The construction of the 3-lift flight at the Miraflores site appears to be practicable, and a large part of the excavation completed for the 2-lift flight could be used for the 3 lifts.

100. In the execution of the plan it would be necessary first to complete the new Miraflores three-lift flight of locks, with the emergency dam and gate sill at the upper and omitted temporarily so that ships could pass through that lock at the present level of Miraflores Lake. The existing dams at Miraflores could be raised and the relocation of towns and facilities required by the higher level of Miraflores Lake could be made at any time. The reconstruction of the existing locks could not be undertaken until the locks at the new Miraflores site were ready for traffic. After they were open, the reconstruction of the old locks would begin. During the reconstruction, a channel to bypass the Pedro Miguel locks would be completed,

except for the removal of a final plug, and Miraflores spillway, if incorporated in the final plan, would be rebuilt to the new elevation. In the meantime, traffic would continue through Pedro Miguel locks but would be diverted through the new Miraflores locks, with lockage through the two lower lifts only. Necessary regulation of Miraflores Lake would have to be accomplished by use of the culverts of the new locks.

101. Upon completion of the reconstruction, Miraflores Lake would be raised to the elevation of Gatun Lake, the bypass channel at Pedro Miguel would be opened, and traffic would be diverted to it and to the reconstructed Miraflores locks. The emergency dam of the new flight would then be constructed and the Pedro Miguel locks would be removed.

102. Traffic would have been suspended for the time required to raise the lake and to remove the plug in the bypass channel at Pedro Miguel. With preparations that could be made in advance, the suspension of traffic would be for only a few days.

103. Throughout the period required for the reconstruction of the existing Miraflores locks, probably 2 years at least, there would be only 1 flight of locks available for use and any accident which rendered any of the new locks inoperable would close the canal to traffic until repairs were effected.

Plan B

104. This plan is similar to plan A, except that the two additional locks chambers to be provided at the Miraflores locks would be added at the north, instead of the south, end of the present locks, and raising the latter would be unnecessary. The encroachment upon the proposed anchorage basin by the new upper locks has been mentioned previously. It appears to be an objection of insufficient importance to warrant the rejection of this plan solely on that account.

105. Sixty-four borings with a total length of 6,300 feet have been made recently in further investigation of the foundations for the 2 proposed upper locks. The investigations show the underlying material at the site to be predominantly a clay-shale of the so-called Cucaracha formation, the weakness of which is well known because of the large slides it has produced in Gallard Cut. The site is traversed by 2 faults, 1 with an intrusion of basalt and the other of volcanic ash. Because of the weakness of the Cucaracha shale in shear, the heterogeneous nature, and low modulus of elasticity of this material, and the presence of the basaltic intrusion across the site, large and unequal settlement may be expected in the high walls required in the proposed new upper chambers. Tentative designs for the walls have been developed but further investigation which is underway will be required before final conclusions can be reached concerning the feasibility of constructing serviceable lock structures at this site.

106. Since this plan would involve no change in the location of the south entrance to these locks, the effects of the Cardenas River would not be aggravated. Other advantages and disadvantages, except cost, would be about the same as plan A. If the unfavorable foundation conditions can be overcome this plan appears to be the best of those suggested.

Plan C

107. This plan would require the construction of 2 new flights of 3 lifts each at the new Miraflores site, the construction of a dam in place of the existing Miraflores locks, and the reconstruction of the Miraflores spillway. The removal of the existing locks at Pedro Miguel is required as in the other plans suggested.

108. The objectionable effects of the Cardenas River on the canal channel would be reduced by its removal in this plan to the southern approach to the new Miraflores site,

109. Since this plan provides only two flights of locks on the Pacific side, the capacity of the canal as measured in lockages would remain as it is at present, instead of being increased 50 percent in normal times and 100 percent during overhaul, as in all of the other plans under consideration. The capacity of the canal measured in vessels would be somewhat higher than these figures indicate because of the increase in the number of locks of large size and the consequent increase in the number of tandem lockages that it would be possible to make. The capacity of the Pacific locks of the canal would be much less than that of the Atlantic locks and would constitute the limiting factor in respect to capacity, which, however, would be sufficient for the immediate requirements and those in prospect for the next two or three decades. When the growth of traffic required, an additional flight of locks could be provided and the plan would then be identical with plan E.

110. The principal objection to this plan, aside from those of time and cost, is in the sacrifice of the principle of dispersion adopted as a safeguard against vital damage by enemy action. With eventual development into plan E, as indicated above, the same dispersion of the several flights of locks would be obtained as in the other plans suggested. The advantage of separation of the locks of each flight would, of course, be lost in this plan, as in all the other plans suggested.

Plan D

111. This plan is similar to plans A and B in its general arrangement, but it provides for the transformation of the existing Miraflores locks into two lifts of sufficient height to meet the requirements of the higher level of Miraflores Lake. Unfavorable features of plan A in the extension of the south entrance toward the mouth of the Cardenas River and the encroachment on the anchorage area by plan B, are avoided in this plan.

112. It retains, however, the other unfavorable features of plan A and introduces additional ones of considerable magnitude in requiring higher-lift locks. They increase the volume of water required for each lockage and increase the difficulty of providing for the close control of a vessel in the locks throughout the greater range of the lift. This is a very important matter in respect to large vessels. Furthermore, the greater range of the lift of each lock would prevent the transit of certain aircraft carriers, whose flight decks exceed the width of the present lock chambers that the existing locks can accommodate.

113. The additional storage made available by the proposed basin is sufficient to compensate for the greater water requirements of the deeper locks of this plan, but if held for that purpose the other benefits of the increased storage would largely be lost. Studies made in connection with the design of the third locks project indicate that the necessary control of a vessel throughout the range of the lift in such a lock can be obtained by special installations, which have been devised, but they are somewhat complicated, expensive, and are untested by actual experience. The inability of aircraft carriers to transit these locks would be less objectionable when the wider locks of the third flight are available, but it is undesirable to rely only on the latter to permit the passage of such vessels.

114. In connection with the third locks project, consideration was given to the advantages and disadvantages of a two-lift flight of locks for the full range from sea level to lake level at Gatun and it was concluded that the three-lift flight was better. The maximum total lift at Miraflores would be higher than at Gatun on account of the greater tidal range on the Pacific side, and the conclusions reached in respect to the Gatun locks would apply with greater force

at Miraflores. Those conclusions would have to be reexamined with great care before the adoption of locks of higher lift at Miraflores, or elsewhere on the Panama Canal, could be recommended.

Plan E

115. This plan is identical with plan C as it might be expected to develop with the growth of traffic beyond the capacity of two flights of locks.

VI. DISCUSSION

116. In section III, paragraphs 24-28, attempt has been made to outline the available information on which it is necessary to rely in evaluating at this time the advantages of the proposal under consideration, which are listed in paragraph 24. In order to make that list comprehensive of all the advantages suggested in the references, a number of advantages that are regarded as inconsequential and others of insufficient importance to affect materially the comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal, are included.

Tangible values

117. The most important advantage, from the economic viewpoint at least, is the reduction in the annual operating cost of the Pacific locks. In plan A or B the ultimate prospective saving would amount to \$520,000 per year.

118. Probably the next most important advantage is the increase in the total usable storage in Gatun Lake as a result of the reduction of the surges in the cut and the addition of Miraflores Lake at the summit level. Together, they would increase the usable storage by about 160,000 acre-feet, which has an immediate value for power purposes in the neighborhood of \$40,000 per year. The ultimate value of this storage may be higher, when it is required for lockages, but that time is remote and the value could be determined only after detailed study of other possibilities that may be better for both power and navigation. It has previously been pointed out that a similar result can be accomplished by either widening or deepening the cut sufficiently to reduce the surges or to permit lower levels in Gatun Lake, and that storage at a higher level than Gatun Lake is more valuable.

119. The reduction of the time of transit by eliminating the delays in approaching and departing from Pedro Miguel locks, which would be avoided in the three-lift flights proposed, would have a large theoretical value, on the order of \$470,000 per year in the near future and increasing through the years with the growth of traffic. It has been pointed out that it is impracticable to recover a substantial part of this saving for the Government.

120. Similar circumstances in respect to the recovery of the value apply to the saving of time of vessels by the use of the anchorage basin to reduce delay on account of fogs. With the great capacity of the locks after the addition of the third set, even if 24-hour operation of the locks were instituted (for which there seems to be little necessity), time could be saved by the use of the anchorage only occasionally and to relatively few vessels. The total saving, even if recoverable, would not be large. It has also been shown that the anchorage basin has no dependable value in deferring the construction of additional locks. The prospective need for them is so remote that in any event little current value could be assigned to the ultimate postponement of their construction.

121. The elimination of bends in the third locks channel and the other benefits in the convenience and safety of navigation that have been suggested are difficult to evaluate, but in view of past experience of accidental damage for which the United States was responsible of less than \$20,000 per year and total economic loss on the same account averaging about \$54,000 annually, \$40,000

would be a liberal estimate of the average annual value of all recoverable benefits that might be expected on this account for many years in the future.

122. The other advantages that have been suggested are small or of doubtful dependability and have insignificant tangible benefits.

123. This brief summary indicates that the economic value of the significant advantages of the modification of the Panama Canal and the third locks project to conform to one of the plans suggested might be represented liberally by an estimate of \$600,000 per year for the economic values which might accrue to the United States, or \$1,070,000 for all economic values, including those not practically recoverable.

124. Obviously, these rough estimates are not entirely conclusive. They can be refined considerably by research similar to that which has been undertaken in the analysis of accidents to vessels, referred to in paragraphs 59-61, but there is little prospect that the whole import of the estimates would be altered. The present estimates are sufficient to show that on an economic basis, the value of the prospective advantages would not approach the additional costs of any of the plans suggested, except, possibly, plan B. The cost of plan B would exceed that of the third locks project by \$30 million, if the tentative designs are acceptable, and without allowance for additional interest during construction on account of the larger capital investment and the longer construction period. The comparison of the additional capital investment and the recoverable benefits is not very favorable to the plan, but the disparity is not great and further investigation is warranted. The disparity between the economic benefit and the additional costs of the other plans, ranging from \$100 million to \$180 million, is sufficient to warrant their rejection on economic grounds, unless intangible considerations of high importance would justify further study.

Intangible values

125. Intangible features are more difficult to appraise, of course. The weight to be given them is a matter of judgment, rather than calculation. Most of the advantages that affect the peacetime operation of the canal are susceptible of reduction to some economic basis, as shown by the preceding discussion. The peacetime benefits for which no bases for economic appraisal at all can be found may be regarded as conveniences which it might be desirable to have but for which there is not sufficient need to warrant the expenditure of millions of dollars nor the risk of extraordinary engineering expedients. In this category are a number of the advantages suggested in the references as pertaining to the proposed plan, such as "simplifies problem of dispatching transit traffic," "in case of slides will enable grouping of ships for rapid passage through slide area," "will reduce unnecessary wear on piloting personnel" which were not listed separately in paragraph 24, but have been included generally under item (6) of the list of advantages.

126. Still more difficult to appraise are the intangibles of wartime operation. All the efforts on peacetime operation would be retained in war, but their relative importance would be greatly changed. Economic features would then become less significant and dependability would become paramount. The time of war vessels may be so valuable that the saving of even 30 minutes per transit would be of high importance in special circumstances. Even the time of merchant vessels may then assume a value hardly measurable in money. These factors illustrate the enhancement of some of the advantages of the proposal that might occur in war. They, and others like them, offset in some measure the disadvantages of the

proposed plan, which, except for cost, are chiefly intangibles of wartime operation.

127. The first of these disadvantages is that of time of completion. The third locks project can be completed in 4 years, at least $1\frac{1}{2}$ years sooner than any of the other plans. If the larger locks may be needed in this war, no doubt the project should be adhered to without substantial modification. At this time, it seems improbable that work on the project will be resumed during the war, and consequently, assuming that a substantial period of peace will follow, this relative disadvantage of the other plans may be ignored.

128. The advantage of the separation of the locks in flight as a safeguard against complete closure of the canal has been pointed out. It affords some protection, but less, it is believed, than the separation of the flights, which is retained in all the suggested plans, except plan C.

129. In wartime the great advantages of the reduction in the cost of operating the locks and of the increased storage in Gatun Lake disappear or diminish in importance. The advantage of the anchorage basin would probably be lost to war vessels during any time in which an attack on the canal was a reasonable possibility, because they would be unwilling to use it.

130. Despite the relatively small magnitude of the hazard of accident in the cut, it would assume greater importance in war. Only recently an important war vessel struck the bank near Cunetto (La Pita) and encountered delay for repairs from an accident that might have been avoided in a wider and straighter channel. While it is generally recognized that the superior power and maneuverability of war vessels reduces their liability to accident in the cut, this accident furnishes current evidence, if any were needed, of the desirability of a better channel. The evidence available on the subject indicates that in channels of the dimensions of those in Gaillard Cut, the width of the channel is of greater importance than the angles of the bends in reducing the probability of accident. But even so, this incident emphasizes the disadvantage of bends such as those in the third locks approach channel and suggests the desirability not only of widening that channel, but also of widening Gaillard Cut to 500 feet, although the justification for either would have to rest chiefly on the intangibles of wartime needs because of the low economic loss shown by the records of accidents. With the wider channels, the minimum time of transit by war vessels could be reduced considerably, in emergencies at least, and the probability of blocking the channel by the sinking of a vessel would be diminished substantially.

131. The consideration of factors which owe their importance chiefly to war conditions should take into account the probabilities of war. None of the improvements under consideration in this report is likely to be of use in this war. It is probable that war exhaustion alone warrants the expectation that many years will elapse before the facilities of the Panama Canal will again be required for war activities. This prospect diminishes the effects of all war factors, but both the premises and the extent of their influence are uncertain matters. For present purposes, it seems necessary to discount the considerations which suggest that a long period of peace can be counted on to follow termination of present hostilities.

132. In reference (d), which is devoted to the relative merits of a high-level lock canal and a sea-level canal, it is recommended that the former be accepted as the best canal for the Isthmus of Panama. The brief discussion on paragraphs 70-75 is believed to show that the comparison is not materially involved in the present subject. The completion of the third locks project would have about the same weight in the consideration

of proposals for a sea-level as the completion of any of the other improvements proposed. It should be noted that practically all of the arguments that have ever been advanced in support of a sea-level canal are based upon the intangibles of war needs, without consideration of economics or cost. The superiority of the high-level canal envisaged in reference (d) is based largely upon assumptions that excessive costs would preclude the provision of a channel adequate for safe and rapid transit. If reliability in war could be considered of such transcendental importance as completely to override economic considerations, it may be that more detailed study than any yet made should be given to the possibilities of a sea-level canal, or of a lock canal at a lower level than the present canal, with water storage in separate reservoirs so that the loss of the contents of Gatun Lake could not insure the suspension of traffic for many months. It is feasible to construct a sea-level canal with channels of any desired dimensions. The costs are not well established, but they would be high.

133. So far as such intangible war benefits are concerned, the third locks project can be completed in the shortest time and is superior to the other plans in respect to the probability of closure of the canal by enemy attack, but the other plans are superior in their contribution to the convenience, speed, and safety with which individual vessels may transit the canal in war, as well as in peace. Wherever the balance may rest in this comparison, it does not seem sufficient to warrant additional expense on the order of \$100 million or more.

Summary

134. Plan B appears to be the only modification suggested which might be adopted with reasonable justification, if the foundation difficulties do not prove insuperable. The investigation of this plan is continuing. Full-scale loading tests on similar foundation material in place is being undertaken and results of the test will give data upon which judgment of the acceptability of the foundations may be founded. These tests will require 3 or 4 months. When the results are available, it is intended to have all the available information concerning the foundations for the locks proposed in plan B reviewed by a special board of consulting engineers and to obtain their individual and collective opinions of the practicability of the foundations and of the plans devised to overcome the unfavorable conditions.

135. In the meantime, the other factors of importance which have been referred to in this report will be developed and analyzed further to determine more precisely the values which should be accorded them. Wartime aspects of the plans will be discussed with members of the local joint board and also with other officials of the War and Navy Departments as opportunities occur.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

136. It is concluded that thorough investigation should be made of the plan, designated plan B in this report, providing for the modification of the existing canal and third locks project to locate all three of the additional larger locks at the new Miraflores site, to add a third lock at the north end of each of the existing Miraflores flights, to construct the appurtenant, replacement and remedial works necessary for raising the level of Miraflores Lake to that of Gatun Lake, and to abandon and remove the existing Pedro Miguel locks.

137. The other plans referred to in this report, including widening Gaillard Cut, should also be studied further to the extent that it may be possible to do so without substantial cost, but expenditures of considerable magnitude should not be incurred on that account, at least until the investigation of plan B has been completed.

138. If the need should arise for the earliest practicable completion of additional locks, the third locks project should be completed without major modification.

Recommendations

139. It is recommended:

(a) That no steps be taken to obtain approval of any change in the existing canal or the present authorized project before the foundation investigations now in progress are completed.

(b) That after completion of those investigations and others which it may be practicable to make in the meantime, a further report on this subject be submitted for final consideration.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, day before yesterday, June 19, I had occasion to meet with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in the Senate Chamber. I understood him to say that there was a possibility of an agreement being reached to increase by \$500 million the Defense Department appropriation bill for the purpose of providing more airplanes for our defense.

I did not understand at the time that the proposal was to be made by way of an amendment to be sponsored only by some of us on the Senate Appropriations Committee who had opposed the billion-dollar-plus proposal offered by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. I discovered last night after reading the RECORD that I was named as cosponsor of the amendment.

I took the position before the committee that I was not in favor of the billion-dollar-plus increase. However, I stated to Senator BRIDGES that if, as I understood, an agreement was reached on both sides to increase the amount by \$500 million, I would not urge objection to that. But I find that there is considerable agitation to increase the sum to the original amount requested before the committee.

I expect to vote against not only the billion-and-some-odd-dollars' increase, but also against the \$500 million proposal should a controversy arise. I was willing to go along with the \$500 million if it meant harmony among the members of the Appropriations Committee.

I expect to vote against not only the billion-and-some-odd-dollars' increase, but also against the \$500 million proposal should a controversy arise. I was willing to go along with the \$500 million if it meant harmony among the members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be stricken from the amendment. I discussed the matter with the Senator from New Hampshire, and I am confident that there was a clear misunderstanding between us. I am sure he acted in good faith and it is not my purpose to cast any reflection on him at all for having placed my name as a cosponsor of this amendment.

The amendment I refer to is labeled 6-19-56-A and it is intended "to be proposed by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. MUNDT)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORT POLICY AND ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in April 1955 there was made public a report entitled "Revisions of Federal Transportation Policy," prepared by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organizations, commonly known as the Cabinet Committee report on transportation. The membership of this committee consisted of the Secretary of Commerce as chairman, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Participating ad hoc members were the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

This report might just as well have been written by the Association of American Railroads because it generally reflects the point of view of the railroads and seeks to advance their interests at the expense of our motor carriers and water carriers.

This charge is serious, but a very grave issue is at stake, and I think it is of utmost importance that my colleagues in the Senate have the facts at hand in connection with any proposed legislation to implement the report which might come before the Senate for consideration.

According to the report, because of the development of highway, air, pipeline, and water carriers, generally with Government aid, the restrictive legislation that was passed when the railroads had a virtual monopoly, is outmoded.

Further dislocations resulting from intense competition, so states the report, at present accompanied by restraining legislation, are unduly oppressive on common carriers, the backbone of the transportation system. The shipper, and in turn the public, pay heavily in increased transportation costs for these dislocations, the Cabinet Committee tells us.

Further, the Cabinet Committee, proceeding from the premise that the transportation system operates under conditions of pervasive competition, concluded that reappraisal and adjustment is necessary in regulatory policies in order to insure a strong system of common carriage for public use and national defense.

I should point out that many of the common carriers do not appreciate the efforts of the Cabinet Committee on their behalf. The railroads are the only group of common carriers that have supported most features of the report. Motor and water carriers almost universally reject the recommendations of the report.

Mr. President, a great deal of time might be consumed in discussing the numerous valid objections to the pro-

posals contained in the Cabinet Committee report. However, at this time, I shall not attempt to explore all of these objections, but instead shall confine my discussion to what I believe are a few major areas in which the report makes proposals contrary to the public interest. These are the proposed changes in the national transportation policy and various revisions in the ratemaking provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

PROPOSED CHANGES OF EXISTING NATIONAL
TRANSPORTATION POLICY

The present declaration of policy set forth in the Interstate Commerce Act provides for "fair and impartial regulations of all modes of transportation so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each without unfair or destructive competitive practices."

The Cabinet Committee would seize upon a pet expression of the huckster in describing the type of competition that it envisages. It calls it "dynamic competition."

That is a very catchy phrase, Mr. President, until we start to analyze the report in terms of the meaning of the semantics used by the committee.

Thus, the report would change the national policy "to provide for and develop under the free-enterprise system of dynamic competition, a national transportation industry." Further, the new policy would "encourage and promote full competition between modes of transportation."

During the months ahead my colleagues may expect to hear the term "dynamic competition" used as another of this administration's ever-growing catalog of slogans. Many of us may not understand fully the meaning of "dynamic competition" but I suspect that it has one meaning for the railroads and another and less desirable meaning for motor and water carriers.

Thus, by the subtle injection of glittering generalities the Cabinet Committee report would substitute for the present prohibition against unfair or destructive competitive practices in the present national transportation policy, a new scheme which allegedly would allow common carriers greater freedom to realize advantages in competitive pricing of their services by "increased reliance on competitive forces in ratemaking."

In order to effectuate this proposed system of "dynamic competition" a number of changes are proposed in the ratemaking provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE RATEMAKING PROVISIONS IN THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Under the existing law the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized to set precise rates, that is, the exact price for a transportation service. Under the Cabinet Committee report however, the ICC would be deprived of its authority to establish precise rates. Instead, the Commission would be limited to establishing just and reasonable minimum rates or just and reasonable maximum rates. In the broad area between these two extremes, carriers would be left free to determine their rates for themselves. This sounds fine in theory but let us test its practical application.

The important point I wish to stress is that if we adopt the report of the Cabinet Committee we shall be reversing a long history of ratemaking, whereby the railroads and other carriers petition the Interstate Commerce Commission for rates, and if they do not like the rates which are fixed, they have the right to appeal. In essence, under the proposal of the Cabinet Committee, the railroads would be relatively free to fix their rates, and if the Government should not like them, the Government could appeal. That is unsound from every standpoint from which we look at it, and it is particularly unsound, in my judgment, from the standpoint of the Government, because, after all, the burden of proof should be upon the carrier and not placed upon the Government. The Government should not, figuratively speaking, have to go hat in hand before judicial tribunals and seek to set aside rates fixed by the carriers. On the contrary, the carriers should go before such tribunals and ask for a change in a ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission if, on the merits, they are entitled to a change.

OUT-OF-POCKET COSTS

According to the Committee's report, minimum rates would be lawful as long as they are not lower than the out-of-pocket costs incurred in rendering the transportation service. As you know, out-of-pocket costs are those that are directly attributable to the handling of the traffic transported; or, to put it another way, costs that would not be incurred if the traffic were not moved. Fixed costs, on the other hand, are those which largely remain constant whether the facility is used slightly or to maximum capacity. Therefore, when the committee would have us apply the out-of-pocket cost test in determining just and reasonable minimum rates, it in effect proposes a windfall for the transportation agency whose operations are characterized by a favorable out-of-pocket cost situation.

Which transportation is so favored? The answer is obvious—the railroad industry is so favored.

If this out-of-pocket formula were applied, the railroads would almost always be in a position to cut their rates to a level lower than their competitors could find profitable. At the same time they could blandly assure the Interstate Commerce Commission that the rates were legal, because they would at least cover out-of-pocket costs.

By way of contrast, the motor-carrier industry is characterized by high out-of-pocket costs and low fixed costs. Thus, under the Cabinet Committee proposals the rules of the game would be set so as to almost always assure the railroads of an opportunity to eliminate their competitors by destructive competition. The ICC would be helpless to interfere so long as the railroads could show that the rates were no lower than the out-of-pocket costs.

If ever a proposed piece of legislation had potentialities for the elimination of competition and the fostering of monopoly transportation, the Cabinet Committee proposal for minimum rates serves as an outstanding example.

It takes no great imagination to foresee the ultimate result under a program of this type. Once the railroads, through their permissible minimum rates based on out-of-pocket costs, have eliminated the competition having relatively high out-of-pocket costs, they can then revert to the standard practice of monopolists and increase rates to the permissible maximum allowed by the law.

Let us not be misled, however, by the concept of maximum rates permitted by law. Under the Cabinet Committee proposal, the lowest maximum rate that could be maintained by the ICC would be a rate based on "fully distributed costs" of rendering the service, which means out-of-pocket costs attributable to the traffic plus its proper share of the overhead costs exclusive of losses in rendering other services. The highest maximum rate is practically without limit, because the Committee set no definitive standards for determining the upper limit of maximum rates.

Those of my colleagues who come from areas in which small communities are served by rail carriers without adequate competition from other modes of transportation can well imagine what will happen to freight rates for those communities under the Cabinet Committee ratemaking proposals.

Mr. President, the other day a very interesting statement was placed in the hearings of a subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on H. R. 6141, which incorporates the Cabinet Committee recommendations. The statement was submitted by a resident of Fargo, N. Dak. I take the liberty of quoting from his statement, which is the practical transportation man's evaluation of the workings of the Cabinet Committee proposals:

It is now proposed to have some dynamic competition. I would like to tell you how this will work for small business.

The railroads will have as a floor their out-of-pocket costs which are lower than motor-carrier costs for all but the lower minimum weights and shorter distances.

To the extent that rail rates gravitate to out-of-pocket costs, the question arises as to who is going to pay the constant cost, the profit and the passenger deficit. We are under no illusions, for we will pay for it on all of our traffic, because it is all noncompetitive.

The railroads will not reduce rates just for the fun of it. They will reduce rates to meet the competition of water transportation, the competition of private truck fleets or threatened diversion to private truck or the competition of the common motor carrier. Even the common motor carrier presents a serious threat, by the nature of their costs, only on short hauls for lighter loads and in areas where balanced traffic loads exist.

The small city or the agricultural State has none of these competitive factors. We have no waterways, private truck fleets are a rarity confined to limited types of business, and common-carrier trucks present no serious competition because of the long one-way hauls involved.

The intention of H. R. 6141 is to introduce a more vigorous competitive atmosphere than already exists. The evils of the present, so far as we are concerned, are to be magnified, and the powers of the Commission to curb the disintegration of the rate structure are to be removed except as to rates which gravitate below directly ascertainable or out-of-pocket costs.

Mr. President, I urge a careful study of the observations made by the witness from Fargo, N. Dak., because they are completely sound as to what will happen if the report of the Cabinet Committee is adopted by Congress.

Sound ratemaking regulatory policy demands that the ICC retain its present authority to establish precise rates as well as minimum and maximum rates. I might add that the Commission has exercised its power to prescribe precise rates very sparingly.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE RULE OF RATE- MAKING

As a corollary to the changes advocated in the minimum and maximum rate provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Cabinet Committee proposes a change in the so-called rule of ratemaking provided in the act. At present the rule requires that the Commission, in the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable rates, must take into account the effect of rates on the movement of traffic and the need of carriers for revenues sufficient to render adequate and efficient service. Under this provision of the law, the ICC has on occasion restrained carriers from cutting rates which do not meet these standards. The Cabinet Committee proposes that the rule of ratemaking be changed to forbid the Commission, when it reviews proposed competitive rates of one form of transportation, to consider, first, the effect of such rates on the traffic of any other mode of transportation; second, the relation of such rates to the rates of any other mode of transportation; or third, whether such rates are lower than necessary to meet the competition.

These three negative provisions proposed by the Cabinet Committee have been termed the three "shall nots." The enactment of the three "shall nots" would insure that the railroads could take advantage of their favorable out-of-pocket cost position under present minimum rate standards of the law.

It is significant, Mr. President, that in recent testimony before a subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee a railroad witness indicated that his principals have for the time being abandoned their demands for enactment of the other recommendations of the Cabinet Committee report and will settle for the enactment of the three "shall nots." I might add, Mr. President, that if this change in the law were made, the railroads would receive the lion's share of the benefits that would accrue to them if other provisions of H. R. 6141 which are designed to produce "increased reliance of competitive forces in ratemaking" were enacted.

Another change proposed by the Cabinet Committee would alter the power of the ICC to suspend and investigate proposed rates of doubtful legality in order to determine their lawfulness. At the present the maximum suspension period is 7 months. Under the Cabinet Committee report it would be 3 months. Such suspensions would be restricted to that of "a special and unusual remedy."

The Commission's experience over the years has shown that 7 months is about the minimum period required to investigate properly such suspended rates. Under the proposed changes the burden of proof would shift from a proponent carrier to a complaining carrier. It seems fairly obvious that a small motor carrier asking for the suspension of the rates of a large railroad would find it almost impossible to bear the burden of proof that the rates were unlawful. We are all aware of the practical disabilities of a small transportation company in this respect.

That is why I am stressing in this speech the importance of keeping the burden of proof exactly where it is today under the law. I again emphasize that we had better always look into the procedures which are proposed in the various pieces of proposed legislation, in order to ascertain what the gimmicks are. This procedural change is one of the dangerous gimmicks of the Cabinet Committee's report. The procedural change with respect to burden of proof is one of the windfalls which would be given to the railroads. It is a procedural windfall which would place the railroads in a very favorable position in any future litigation involving ratemaking.

Mr. President, we had better take a long, hard, careful look at the procedural changes suggested when it comes to the question of the burden of proof, because if the procedure which is proposed by the Cabinet Committee should be adopted, very unfair discrimination would be practiced against the small carriers of America to the advantage of the great railroads.

Mr. President, I stress the point that it seems fairly obvious that a small motor carrier asking for the suspension of the rates of a large railroad would, as I said before, find it impossible to bear the burden of proof that the rates were unlawful. All of us are aware of the practical disabilities of a small transportation company in this respect.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LONG-AND- SHORT-HAUL CLAUSE OF THE ICC

The administration's proposal on this item figuratively pokes a stick into a hornet's nest. The long-and-short-haul clause of the act has had a stormy career. Efforts to weaken it will only engender further controversy. The present law requires that the rail or water common carriers subject to ICC regulation obtain prior approval of the Commission before charging more than the aggregate of the intermediate rates or before charging more for shorter than for longer hauls over the same line or route in the same direction. The proposal would allow these carriers to violate these principles if it could be shown that the making of such rate was necessary to meet actual competition and the rate charged is not less than a reasonable minimum rate; that is, not less than the out-of-pocket costs of handling the traffic.

Therefore, I emphasize in this speech, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, that the small-business men of America had better be on guard in respect to the procedural changes proposed

by the Cabinet Committee's report, because, in my judgment, the proposal is not in the interest of the small-business men of America. As chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I intend to do everything I can to forewarn small business of the dangerous potentialities of the Cabinet Committee's report, known as the Weeks Report.

Such a change in the law would allow railroads to pinpoint their competition and make rates low enough to defeat that competition. Mr. President, if this change were made in the law, I believe I am safe in predicting that in only a few months water carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act would be destroyed by the resulting railroad competition. Some of the motor carriers might survive longer. Generally, however, the motor carrier industry as we know it today would be reduced to but a comparatively unimportant mode of transportation.

INCENTIVE RATES

A proposal of the Cabinet Committee that is particularly suited to the administration's program is that which would make lawful, incentive rates on large volume traffic movements.

It is another example of playing into the hands of the big boys. It is another example of big business favoritism at the expense of small business. Watch out for the procedural gimmicks in the proposal, because the procedures will do damage to the small-business men.

Under this proposal the large shipper would receive reduced rates on large volumes of traffic. The small-business man would not be able to compete with the large shipper under such an arrangement.

There are other proposed changes in the regulatory pattern suggested in the Cabinet Committee report, many of which are as unfair and unsound as those I have just mentioned, but I consider the items I have just discussed as those which comprise the most serious threats to adequate transportation regulation contained in the report.

Before closing, I should call attention to an amazing provision of H. R. 6141, and S. 1920, the companion bill.

This is section 25 of these bills which provides:

Outstanding effective orders prescribing minimum, maximum, or maximum-and-minimum rates, fares, or charges, or issued under section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, prior to its amendment by this act, shall not have any force and effect with respect to rates, fares, or charges filed 180 days after the enactment hereof.

Under this section, all outstanding orders of the ICC apparently would automatically expire upon the publication and filing of such rates as the carrier might choose to establish to supplant those required by existing orders. My colleagues from the South and West may recall the struggle of many years' duration to rid those areas of a discriminatory basic freight rate structure. After years of hearings by the ICC and action by the Supreme Court, the South and West obtained a class rate system of freight rates on the same level as

that given to the formerly favored official territory.

In my opinion, the passage of section 25 would allow the rail carriers, if they chose—and we can be very certain they would so choose—to substitute a completely different system, one that might increase the discriminations formerly contained in the regionalized class rate structures.

Mr. President, so far as I can ascertain at the present time, it does not appear likely that the legislative proposals to implement the Cabinet Committee report will reach the floor of the Senate for action, but if they should, I urge my colleagues to give these proposals serious study. They constitute a threat to our motor and water carriers and to the shipping public, who, after all, must pay the excessive bills presented by monopolists in any field of economic endeavor.

Mr. President, lest it should be attempted, in the closing days or hours of this session, to have the Senate pass this proposed bill, I think it is very important that we give notice that it must be subjected to considerable debate. All the complex procedural changes recommended ought to be brought under the scrutiny of careful debate and analysis on the floor of the Senate, before we run the risk of imposing on the small-business men of America, and upon the motor and water transportation carriers of America, this railroad bill. In essence, I respectfully submit, it is a bill which is loaded with unfair discrimination in favor of the railroads and against the legitimate competitive interests of the motor and water carriers of America.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. YI-PING KIANG, MEMBER OF FORMOSA LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have been privileged to welcome a number of visitors from foreign lands. The world has grown so small that what yesterday were considered distant lands are today in our own neighborhood.

We have heard of Formosa. It has been called Taiwan. Today we have with us one of the legislators from Taiwan, Hon. Yi-Ping Kiang. I ask that he stand and be welcomed by Members of the Senate.

[The visitor rose and was greeted with hearty applause, Senators rising.]

SENATOR FROM KENTUCKY—APPOINTMENT AND WITHDRAWAL OF APPOINTMENT OF JOSEPH J. LEARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate two communications received from the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Honorable Albert Benjamin Chandler, Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Frankfort, June 18, 1956.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, I, Albert Benjamin Chandler, the Governor of said Commonwealth, do hereby appoint Joseph J. Leary a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Senator Alben W. Barkley, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency, our Gov. A. B. Chandler, and our seal hereto affixed at Frankfort, Ky., this 18th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1956.

ALBERT BENJAMIN CHANDLER,
Governor.

By the Governor:

THELMA L. STOVALL,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a telegram signed by Gov. A. B. Chandler, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

FRANKFORT, KY., June 21, 1956.

HON. FELTON M. JOHNSON,
Secretary of the Senate, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please return certificate of appointment on Joseph J. Leary, who has declined to serve. We are sending papers on Hon. Robert Humphreys.

GOV. A. B. CHANDLER.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit an order and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That in view of the declination of Joseph J. Leary of the appointment by the Governor of Kentucky as Senator from that State to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator Alben W. Barkley, the certificate of appointment of Mr. Leary be returned by the Secretary of the Senate to the Governor, in compliance with his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order?

There being no objection, the order was considered and agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate appropriations subcommittee charged with the consideration of H. R. 10986, I have the privilege to present to the Senate a summary of the major provisions of this bill and an explanation of the various amendments recommended by the committee.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations of the Senate Appropriations Commit-

tee worked earnestly and diligently for many weeks in receiving and considering testimony on the largest and, we believe, the most important single appropriation to come before this body.

To indicate even partially how large the pending bill is, let me say that in round figures it provides approximately \$35 billion, which is more than the cost of Government for all the other departments, including the independent offices. That will give my colleagues an idea of how vast the bill is.

This year, perhaps more than at any time in recent years, there has been a virtual avalanche of conflicting advice and opinions on national defense policies and programs. Millions of words have been written in the Nation's newspapers and magazines, and spoken over the Nation's radio and television networks, about the numerous and varied aspects of our national defense program. Various committees of the Congress have held, or are still holding, hearings on particular problem areas in the defense program, and great quantities of testimony have been produced.

Conflicting views have been presented, not only by civilian enthusiasts of a particular branch of the armed services or a particular military theory or concept, but also by eminently qualified professional military men and by present or former officials of the Department of Defense. Confronted by this tremendous volume of information and conflicting views, the committee has had to delve deeply into many of the major issues involved in the national defense program, and carefully to separate fact from opinion in arriving at its conclusions as to what is required for the national security.

At this time last year, when the Defense Department appropriations for fiscal year 1956 were before the Senate, there was considerable hope that some progress would be achieved in working out, with the U. S. S. R., ways and means for easing international tension. We were then just about to enter into new negotiations with that nation in a sincere effort to find a road to a just and durable peace.

Unfortunately, these hopes have not been fulfilled. Although the U. S. S. R. has recently announced a further reduction of 1,200,000 men in her armed forces, there is ample evidence that in the type of military power that constitutes the real threat to our national security, the Russians have made no reduction; but, in fact, have made very considerable increases. Among informed persons, there is now general agreement that the U. S. S. R. is making rapid progress in science and technology and in the development and production of modern armaments, particularly jet-powered aircraft, including long-range bombers, guided missiles, and nuclear weapons. What new surprises will be unveiled to the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force during his impending visit to the U. S. S. R., we do not know; but it is clear that the Russians are bending every effort to catch up and, if possible, to overtake us in the development of modern military forces.

Although very real changes appear to be going on in the U. S. S. R., there is as yet no evidence that these changes bode well for the free world. Most important, at the present time there is no indication that the U. S. S. R. seriously intends to negotiate for a workable system of disarmament or arms reduction. Under these circumstances, the United States has no choice but to maintain for an indefinite period of time in the future a large Military Establishment of growing combat effectiveness.

While there is general agreement as to the need for a large Military Establishment, the question remains, how large should it be, and what should be its composition? This is not a question which can easily be answered by laymen. In fact, it is a matter upon which even professional military men cannot agree; so it is not surprising that there are some differences of viewpoint among the members of the committee.

Mr. President, I wish to say right here and now, and in the most emphatic manner at my command, that every member of the committee is deeply concerned with the problem of providing adequate security for our country. I do not wish in any way, shape, or form to leave the impression that the members of the committee who voted against certain of our recommendations for increases over the amounts voted by the House are any less concerned with providing adequate national defense than are those who voted for them. Every one of the distinguished Senators who serve with me on the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations is sincerely determined to provide the military forces required for the Nation's defense.

The determination of what is an adequate defense at any particular time and in any particular situation is a very complicated process. Not only must we consider strictly military matters, but we must also consider all the other factors which bear on the problem. We must consider the financial needs of other Government programs, such as foreign aid, atomic energy, the farm programs, education, highways, and so forth. We must also consider the tax burden our citizens must bear and the inflationary dangers of continual budget deficits. All of us recognize that the threat to our security is likely to continue for many years in the future, and that the financial burdens of defense will be with us for many years to come. In weighing all these diverse factors, which must be taken into consideration in answering the question of what is adequate defense under any particular set of circumstances, there is a great deal of room for honest differences of judgment.

The majority of the committee is of the opinion that the defense budget requested by the administration, including the amendments of April 9, which were substantially included in the House version of the bill, leans too far in the direction of austerity. Because there is so much uncertainty as to our military position relative to that of the U. S. S. R., particularly in the 1959-60 period, the majority of the committee believes that we should lean over backward to assure

that during the coming fiscal year a lack of funds will not be a limiting factor on the further development of our most critical military programs. Admittedly, this is a matter of judgment; but the majority of the committee feels that, all things considered, some additional insurance is warranted, in view of the uncertainties surrounding our future military capabilities, as compared with those of the U. S. S. R.

The bill as reported to the Senate by the committee provides a total of \$34,983,734,000 — \$1,348,668,000 more than the amount voted by the House, \$835,884,000 more than the amount requested by the President, and \$3,090,500,374 more than the amount appropriated for these purposes to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1956.

I am trying to give the figures so that every Member of the Senate will understand what is being done when the time comes for the passage of the bill. I am trying to analyze the reasons for the action of the majority of the committee.

Under this bill, the Army will continue at about its present level, ending the fiscal year with 19 divisions, 10 regiments, and 140 antiaircraft battalions. The Navy will increase somewhat the number of active ships to 988, including 409 warships. The Marine Corps will continue to maintain its 3 divisions and 3 air wings at a high state of combat readiness. They are always ready. That is one branch of the Defense Department which is always prepared for action.

The Air Force will complete its buildup to 137 wings, including 126 combat wings.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a table showing a summary of military forces planned for June 30, 1957, as compared with the forces planned for June 30, 1956, and the actual forces on hand on June 30 and December 31, 1955.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of military forces

	June 30, 1955	Actual, Dec. 31, 1955	June 30, 1956	June 30, 1957
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
Divisions.....	20	20	18	19
Regiments/RCTs.....	12	12	10	10
Antiaircraft battalions.....	122	126	133	140
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY				
Active ships, total.....	1,030	984	982	988
Major combatant.....	402	403	404	409
Other active ships.....	628	581	578	579
Marine divisions.....	3	3	3	3
Marine aircraft wings.....	3	3	3	3
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE				
Wings, total.....	121	127	131	137
Combat.....	108	114	118	126
Troop carrier.....	13	13	13	11

Mr. CHAVEZ. These forces will provide a growing retaliatory capability, not only in the Air Force, but in the other services as well. They will provide an increasingly effective continental defense

system, comprising an outer zone early warning radar network, stretching across the top of the North American Continent and extending in both oceans across the seaward approaches to the United States, and an inner zone system of radars, ground electronics environment and weapons for the protection of our cities, industrial centers, and military installations. Included also are the essential tactical forces, required both for general war and limited war, as well as the naval forces needed to protect the sea lines of communication with our allies and our forces overseas.

The organization, equipping, and training of these forces will increasingly reflect the integration of new weapons and the adoption of new tactics and techniques required for effective defense in the nuclear age.

The bill as amended by the committee provides for a total military personnel strength of a little over 2,870,000 men, for the end of fiscal year 1957—1,045,000 for the Army, 678,000 for the Navy, 206,000 for the Marine Corps, and 941,000 for the Air Force. The strength figure for the Air Force is 4,900 greater than that provided in the House bill. I will discuss this increase in greater detail later in my statement.

Overall, the bill provides a relatively small increase of about 50,000 over the total military personnel strength of \$2,820,000 estimated for June 30, 1956. The Air Force, which is still building toward the 137-wing goal, is provided an increase of about 25,000 for the coming fiscal year, the Navy an increase of about 15,000, and the Marine Corps and Army an increase of 5,000 each. The increases in the Army and Navy will take care of certain new activities recently assigned to those services.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a summary of military personnel strengths as of the end of fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Military personnel strengths

	Actual end strength, June 30, 1955	Estimated end strength, June 30, 1956	Planned end strength, June 30, 1957
Department of Defense, total.....	2,934,556	2,820,024	2,870,158
Army.....	1,108,745	1,040,250	1,045,300
Navy.....	660,695	662,774	678,223
Marine Corps.....	205,170	201,000	205,735
Air Force.....	959,946	916,000	940,900

Mr. CHAVEZ. The military services have made good progress in the past few years in improving the utilization of their manpower. With continued progress in this area the numbers of military personnel provided for fiscal year 1957 should be adequate to man properly the forces planned for that period.

For the Reserve forces funds are provided in the bill, as amended by the committee, for a total of approximately 1,117,000 men to be engaged in regular paid drills by the end of fiscal year 1957.

Those are the Reserves and the National Guard, separate and apart from the military personnel belonging to the Department of Defense. The Reserves are growing by leaps and bounds. Those are the home troops in every State, whom all the neighbors know and respect.

This is an increase of almost 150,000 men in drill pay status during fiscal year 1957. Most of the increase will be in the Army Reserve component. The committee has provided funds for a total of 425,000 reservists in drill pay status at the end of fiscal year 1957 in the Army National Guard as compared with the 408,100 provided in the House bill. The reasons for this increase will be explained later.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a table showing the increase in the number of reservists in drill pay status from the end of fiscal year 1955 to the end of fiscal year 1957.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reserve personnel in drill pay status

	Actual end strength June 30, 1955	Esti- mated end strength June 30, 1956	Planned end strength June 30, 1957
Department of Defense, total	826,196	967,419	1,116,684
Department of the Army	521,378	622,155	723,600
Army National Guard	358,241	407,100	425,000
Army Reserve	163,137	215,055	298,600
Department of the Navy	191,908	210,299	225,419
Naval Reserve	149,142	159,691	165,359
Marine Corps Reserve	42,856	50,608	60,060
Department of the Air Force	112,820	134,965	167,665
Air National Guard	61,306	63,280	67,980
Air Force Reserve	51,514	71,685	99,685

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Defense Department's fiscal year 1957 programs provide for a continued increase in the combat effectiveness of the Reserve Forces. The facilities and equipment of the Reserve components are being steadily modernized and expanded. A substantial number of jet aircraft will be provided the flying elements of the Reserve Forces in fiscal year 1957. Training programs are being improved and general combat readiness raised. Reservists, who for various reasons may not be available for prompt entry on active duty in the event of war or national emergency will be screened out of the Ready Reserves.

Elements of the Air National Guard are now participating with Regular units of the Air Defense Command of the Air Force in the maintenance of the 24-hour aircraft alert. A growing number of Army National Guard antiaircraft battalions are also actively participating in the peacetime continental defense system. The weapons and equipment of these battalions are located on site and are kept in instant readiness by caretaker crews of civilian personnel who are also members of the Army National Guard so that in an emergency they can go into action in a very short time.

Mr. President, I now would like to review the principal provisions of the bill,

but before doing so I would like to discuss a matter which affects several of the Army and Air Force appropriations, and that is deutschemark support of our forces in Germany.

Senators will recall that under section 727 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1955 agencies of the Department were authorized to accept real property, the use of real property, services, and other commodities from foreign countries for the use of the United States in accordance with mutual-defense agreements or occupational arrangements, and to use same for the support of United States forces in such areas without specific appropriations therefor.

Basically, this permitted the Department of Defense agencies to accept deutschemark support for our occupation forces in Germany without charge to appropriations. The Department of Defense fiscal year 1955 budget was originally submitted on a gross dollar basis; that is, the dollar value of the deutschemark support expected to be received by our forces in Germany was included in the appropriations requests. By enacting section 727, the Congress was enabled to delete \$355 million from the Defense Department budget for that fiscal year.

In other words, the arrangement for the use of the deutschemark permitted us to reduce the budget for that year by \$355 million.

Last year the Defense Department budget was again submitted on a gross-dollar basis. The Congress continued the authority originally contained in section 727 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1955 as section 626 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1956. This again enabled the Congress to delete from the Defense Department 1956 budget the sum of \$296 million, the deutschemark equivalent included in that budget.

This year we are confronted with a different situation. Prior to the entry of the Federal Republic of Germany into NATO, agreement was reached between the Allied Powers and Germany on specific levels of deutschemark support to be provided during the first year after Germany's entry into NATO. This period expired on May 5, 1956. At the time the fiscal year 1957 budget was submitted to the Congress, there was no agreement between the Allied Powers and Germany as to the nature and extent of deutschemark support that would be provided by Germany after May 5, 1956. Because of the uncertainty as to the nature and extent of deutschemark support that might be available to the Department of Defense agencies in fiscal year 1957, the Defense Department budget for that fiscal year was again submitted on a gross basis pending agreement with Germany on continued support. A total of \$276,319,000 was included in lieu of continued deutschemark support for our forces in Germany.

At the time the Defense Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1957 was before the House, the question of additional support to be provided by the Federal Republic of Germany remained unresolved. The House Appropriations Committee, however, recommended the deletion of the \$276,319,000 in lieu of

deutschemark support and stated in its report:

While it is understood that negotiations for the extension of these arrangements into the ensuing fiscal year are now pending, the committee is assuming that the arrangements will be extended in substantially the present form.

But they were not.

Subsequently, an interim arrangement was worked out with the Federal Republic of Germany whereby that country agreed to continue to provide support for United States forces through June 30, 1956, with settlement of the obligations incurred during this period dependent upon the outcome of the deutschemark support negotiations.

On June 7, 1956, agreement was reached with the Federal Republic of Germany under which the United States will be provided goods and services amounting to 650 million deutschemarks, or the equivalent of \$154,761,900 for the 1-year period May 6, 1956, to May 5, 1957, inclusive. On a prorata basis, the Department of Defense estimates that the equivalent of \$41 million of this amount will be allocated to cover deutschemark obligations incurred under the interim arrangements for the period May 6 to June 30, 1956. This would leave the equivalent of \$113,761,900 in deutschemark support for fiscal year 1957 if the agreement is not extended beyond May 5, 1957. This compares with the fiscal year 1957 budget estimate of \$261,757,200 in deutschemark support for the maintenance of United States forces in Germany, leaving a deficit, if no further deutschemark support is forthcoming, of \$147,995,300. The Department of Defense has requested restoration of this \$147,995,300.

Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Appropriations and the two Houses of Congress, taking their work seriously, of necessity hope that arrangements will be made by the State Department and by the Defense Department under which the German Government will accept its fair share of deutschemark support, so that the American people will not be burdened too heavily.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Comptroller—to the chairman, Department of Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, dated June 11, 1956, which provides further details on this matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 11, 1956.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,

Chairman, Department of Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During my testimony before your committee on the fiscal year 1957 budget request for the Department of Defense, I stated:

"Prior to the entry of the Federal Republic of Germany into NATO, agreement was reached between the Allied Powers and Germany on specific levels of deutschemark

support to be provided during the first year after Germany's entry into NATO. This period expires on May 5, 1956. Although there have been discussions with the Federal Republic of Germany on this matter, no agreement has yet been reached concerning the nature and extent of support that will be provided by Germany after May 5, 1956. A small amount of deutschmark support will continue to be received from the Berlin Magistrat regardless of the progress of negotiations with the Federal Republic of Germany since such support can be expected to continue so long as that city remains under four-power occupation.

"The committee will recall that our budget for fiscal year 1956 was submitted on a 'gross' dollar basis last year, and that \$296 million was properly deleted from our budget when the authority contained in section 626 was continued for the Department of Defense. Because of Bureau of the Budget instructions, and the current uncertainty as to the nature and extent of deutschmark support that will be available, our budget for fiscal year 1957 is again submitted on a 'gross' dollar basis, pending agreement on continued support. We will keep this committee advised of the progress of negotiations and hope to be able to provide definite figures prior to final action by the committee on this bill."

Based on the above, the following amounts were included in the fiscal year 1957 budget requests in lieu of continued deutschmark support:

Army:
 Military personnel..... \$4,926,000
 Maintenance and operations... 224,018,000
Total, Army..... 228,944,000

Air Force:
 Military personnel..... 1,560,000
 Maintenance and operations... 45,815,000
Total, Air Force..... 47,375,000
Total, Department of Defense..... 276,319,000

The amount of additional support to be provided by the Federal Republic of Germany remained unresolved while the bill was under consideration by the House of Representatives. The House committee, however, recommended the reduction of the \$276,319,000 and stated in its report:

"While it is understood that negotiations for the extension of these arrangements into the ensuing fiscal year are now pending, the committee is assuming that the arrangements will be extended in substantially the present form."

Because agreement could not be reached prior to May 5, 1956, the expiration date of the existing agreement, on the nature and extent of continued deutschmark support to be provided to United States forces by the Federal Republic of Germany, interim arrangements were worked out under which

the Federal Republic of Germany agreed to continue to provide support for United States forces through June 30, 1956, with settlement of the obligations incurred during this period dependent upon the outcome of the deutschmark-support negotiations.

On June 7, 1956, agreement was reached that the Federal Republic of Germany will provide United States forces with goods and services amounting to 650 million deutschmarks (equivalent to \$154,761,900) for the 1-year period May 6, 1956 to May 5, 1957, inclusive. On a pro rata basis, it is anticipated that the equivalent of \$41 million of this amount will be allocated to cover deutschmark obligations incurred under the interim arrangements for the period May 6 to June 30, 1956. This would provide the equivalent of \$113,761,900 in deutschmark support for maintenance of United States forces in Germany in fiscal year 1957 through May 5, 1957.

It is not possible at this time to estimate what support the United States will receive from the Federal Republic of Germany after

May 5, 1957, toward meeting the costs of maintaining United States forces in Germany. The nature and extent of continued support for the United States forces will depend in large part on the progress made by Germany in building up its own forces.

The fiscal year 1957 budget estimate of \$276,319,000 in lieu of deutschmark support provided \$261,757,200 for maintenance of United States forces in Germany and \$14,561,800 for maintenance of United States forces in Berlin. It is anticipated that adequate deutschmark support will be provided by the Berlin Magistrat, but, as stated above, only \$113,761,900 can be considered definitely available in fiscal year 1957 in the Federal Republic of Germany, or \$147,995,300 less than the budget estimate. On this basis, the amounts required for restoration to fund the military personnel and maintenance and operation appropriations of the Army and the Air Force through June 30, 1957, without taking into consideration the possible provision of continued support by the Federal Republic of Germany after May 5, 1957, are as follows:

	Army		Air Force	
	Military personnel	Maintenance and operations	Military personnel	Operation and maintenance
President's budget request.....	\$3,585,000,000	\$3,192,000,000	\$3,727,000,000	\$3,786,000,000
House action.....	3,566,704,000	2,954,581,000	3,718,440,000	3,684,185,000
Restoration requested May 17, 1956.....		12,476,000	7,000,000	56,000,000
Total requested of Senate, May 17, 1956.....	3,566,704,000	2,967,057,000	3,725,440,000	3,740,185,000
Additional funds required for fiscal year 1957 because of deficiency in deutschmark support.....	773,400	121,495,770	245,000	25,481,130
Revised total request to Senate.....	3,567,477,400	3,088,552,770	3,725,685,000	3,765,666,130

However, since the United States may receive continued deutschmark support from Germany after May 5, 1957, it might be the desire of the Congress not to finance by dollar appropriation at this time the costs of maintaining our forces in Germany during the period May 5 to June 30, 1957. On a pro

rata basis, this would amount to \$41 million, as shown in the attachment to this letter. On this basis, the amounts which would be required for restoration in the maintenance and operations appropriations of the Army and the Air Force are as follows:

	Maintenance and operations, Army	Operation and maintenance, Air Force
President's budget request.....	\$3,192,000,000	\$3,786,000,000
House action.....	2,954,581,000	3,684,185,000
Restoration requested, May 17, 1956.....	12,476,000	56,000,000
Total requested of Senate, May 17, 1956.....	2,967,057,000	3,740,185,000
Additional funds required through May 5, 1957, because of deficiency in deutschmark support.....	88,369,170	18,626,130
Revised total request to Senate.....	3,055,426,170	3,758,811,130

If it is the desire of the Congress to choose the latter course, it should be understood that in the absence of an adequate level of continued deutschmark support after May 5, 1957, additional dollar appropriations of up to \$41 million would be required to bring the Military Personnel and Maintenance and

Operations appropriations of the Army and the Air Force into line with the amounts currently approved by the House, plus the amounts currently required to offset the deficiency in deutschmark support.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. McNEIL.

Relation of requested restoration to amounts reduced from fiscal year 1957 budget in anticipation of continued availability of \$276,319,000 deutschmark support

	Army			Air Force			
	Total	Military personnel	Maintenance and operations	Total	Military personnel	Operation and maintenance	Grand total
Reduction by House.....	\$228,944,000	\$4,926,000	\$224,018,000	\$47,375,000	\$1,560,000	\$45,815,000	\$276,319,000
Less deutschmark support, Berlin Magistrat.....	12,741,530		12,741,530	1,820,270		1,820,270	14,561,800
Equals estimate for forces in Germany.....	216,202,470	4,926,000	211,276,470	45,554,730	1,560,000	43,994,730	261,757,200
Less deutschmark support available in fiscal year 1957 for forces in Germany.....	93,933,300	4,152,600	89,780,700	19,828,600	1,315,000	18,513,600	113,761,900
Equals additional funds required for fiscal year 1957.....	122,269,170	773,400	121,495,770	25,726,130	245,000	25,481,130	147,995,300
Less requirements for May 6 to June 30, 1957.....	33,900,000	773,400	33,126,600	7,100,000	245,000	6,855,000	41,000,000
Equals dollar restoration required through May 5, 1957.....	88,369,170		88,369,170	18,626,130		18,626,130	106,995,300

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the committee is of the belief that a more satisfactory arrangement should be made with the Federal Republic of Germany so that the cost of supporting our troops in Germany would be more equitably divided. For this reason, the Department of Defense request for restoration of funds to cover the deficiencies in deutschemark support was not allowed at this time. However, the committee wishes it understood that the reduction in funds shall in no wise interfere with planned troop strengths and facilities in Germany. I believe it only fair to caution the Senate that we may be forced to provide additional funds for this purpose at a later date in the event that more satisfactory arrangements cannot be achieved.

Mr. President, I should now like to return to the principal provisions of the bill as recommended by the committee.

For the Office of the Secretary of Defense there is provided a total of \$14,950,000. This is the same sum recommended in the House bill and requested in the President's budget.

For interservice activities, the committee recommends \$643,875,000. This is the same amount recommended in the House bill, but is \$13.5 million less than the amount requested in the President's budget. The Department of Defense had also requested the reapportionment of \$100 million for reserve tools and facilities. This was denied by the House because of the \$200 million made available for this purpose in previous years only \$15 million will finally remain allocated to the services. Furthermore, the Department of Defense has changed its policy in this regard and such tools will now be included in current production programs.

The Department of Defense has not requested restoration of any of these funds, and none are recommended by the committee.

For the Department of the Army, the committee recommends a total of \$7,545,787,000. This is \$48,205,000 more than the amount recommended in the House bill, but \$215,638,000 less than the budget estimate. However, excluding the deletion of \$228,944,000 in lieu of deutschemark support, the amount recommended by the committee is actually \$13,306,000 in excess of the budget estimate.

The sum of \$3,566,704,000 is provided for military personnel, the same amount as recommended in the House bill, but \$18,296,000 below the budget estimate; \$4,926,000 of this difference represents dollars in lieu of deutschemark support, \$8,370,000 reflects savings in subsistence, and \$5 million a reduction in travel. Aside from the deutschemark deficiencies, none of these reductions will affect the Army's ability to adequately support its planned June 30, 1957, personnel strength of 1,045,300 men, including the increased requirements in support of the Reserve Forces Act, and the distant early warning line.

The sum of \$2,967,057,000 is provided for maintenance and operation. This is \$12,476,000 more than the amount recommended in the House bill, but \$224,943,000 below the budget estimate; \$224,018,000 of the difference represents dollars in lieu of deutschemark support.

Except for a reduction of \$925,000 made by the House—the cost of tuition for 24 officers in civilian law schools—the committee recommends restoration of the funds deleted by the House from this appropriation, namely, \$12,476,000. The committee believes the restoration of these funds is justified to assist the Department of the Army in meeting certain unanticipated expenses, such as increases in wage rates for foreign national employees of the Department and increases in railroad freight rates authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission. These increases were not known at the time the budget was prepared and were, therefore, not included.

The sum of \$60 million is provided for military construction for Army Reserve forces. This is \$20 million more than the amount recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimate. The additional \$20 million recommended by the committee is for National Guard military construction—\$16 million for armory construction and \$4 million for nonarmory construction. Testimony adduced before the committee revealed that these additional amounts are required if the National Guard military construction program is to proceed in an expeditious manner. The difficulties experienced with this construction program in past years have been largely removed and there is every reason to believe that these additional funds can be properly utilized during the coming fiscal year. This recommendation is related to the committee's recommendation for an increase in Army National Guard strength during the coming fiscal year.

The committee recommends for the Army National Guard a total of \$321,492,000—\$15,492,000 more than the amount recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimate. Of this increase, \$11,162,000 is to provide for an additional 16,900 Army National Guard men on drill pay status during fiscal year 1957, raising the total end strength to 425,000 as compared with a budgeted end strength of 408,100 men. The budgeted strength for end fiscal year 1957 is only 1,000 greater than the estimated strength on June 30, 1956. The committee feels the Army National Guard should be encouraged to continue its growth in consonance with the intent of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. An increase of only 1,000 during fiscal year 1957 is entirely unrealistic.

Testimony before the committee clearly revealed that on a conservative basis the guard could readily attain an end fiscal year 1957 strength of 425,000.

The committee also recommends an additional \$4 million to enable the Army National Guard to increase the number of technicians by 552, and to provide for the equalization of the Army National Guard technician pay-grade structure. If this is not done, the additional cost of reclassification will have to be absorbed through reduction in pay or by no new authorized employment. The committee also recommends the appropriation of \$330,000 to assure National Guard teams the opportunity of attending national rifle matches during fiscal year 1957.

I think every Senator is familiar with the national rifle matches which take place every year, and which have taken place annually for many years.

The sum of \$215 million is recommended for the Army Reserve, the same amount recommended in the House bill, but \$8 million less than the budget estimate. A major portion of this reduction is to reflect more realistic estimates of the number of men who might be expected to enter the 6-month training program authorized under the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. This reduction should in no wise slow down this important program. The funds recommended will provide for a total of 298,600 Army reservists on drill-pay status for the end of fiscal year 1957 compared with an estimated 215,055 on June 30, 1956, an increase of almost 85,000. The Department of the Army has not requested restoration of the funds deleted by the House, and none is recommended by the committee.

The sum of \$410 million is recommended for Army research and development. This is the same amount as that recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimate. This sum is \$77 million more than the amount appropriated for this purpose for fiscal year 1956. It should enable the Army to carry on a vigorous and farsighted research and development program, particularly in the guided-missile and electronics fields.

The committee received information to the effect that this is one area in which the United States may be backward, and in which some military men feel that Soviet Russia may be ahead of us.

There is an urgent need for the Army to develop and introduce into the forces the new and modern weapons required to insure a highly mobile force with the utmost capability and fire power.

For the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, the committee recommends a total of \$534,000—\$237,000 more than the amount recommended in the House bill and \$109,000 greater than the budget estimate. This board is responsible for encouraging rifle practice, particularly among those citizens not ordinarily reached in the Army training programs. For example, high-school boys are taught to shoot a .22 caliber rifle or a .30-caliber rifle.

It is the opinion of the committee that rifle practice aids national preparedness by providing able-bodied citizens training in the use of small arms. It was testified before the committee that funds were not available for the purchase of .22-caliber ammunition for the younger age group and for travel of civilian teams to national rifle matches and small-arms firing schools. The Department of the Army requested restoration of \$128,000 for travel and the committee recommends the appropriation of this amount. In addition, the committee recommends the appropriation of \$109,000 for the purchase of .22 caliber ammunition, and also approval of section 633 of the general provisions of this bill which authorizes transfer of other types of ammunition to the board, without reimbursement.

The sum of \$5 million is recommended for the Alaska communication system, the same amount recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimate.

No new funds were requested for Army procurement and production for fiscal year 1957 since ample funds are available from prior year appropriations. It is estimated that the Army will carry over into fiscal year 1957 a total of \$2,113,000,000 in this appropriation. That is the backlog. This will adequately support the Army's obligational program of \$1,386,000,000 planned for fiscal year 1957. A large proportion of these funds will be devoted to the procurement of guided missiles, aircraft, and other modern weapons.

The committee recommends for the Department of the Navy a shade less than \$10 billion—\$9,999,997,000. This is \$463,000 more than the amount recommended in the House bill but \$47,603,000 less than the budget estimate.

For naval petroleum reserves, the committee recommends \$1,183,000—\$500,000 more than the amount recommended in the House bill but \$29,000 less than the budget estimate. The House deleted from the budget request \$529,000 for the proposed exploration and drilling on San Nicholas Island, Calif., as there appears to be no authority or justification for this project. However, no funds were requested by the Navy for the maintenance, protection, and conservation of the Government's oil-shale plant at Rifle, Colo. The committee supports the House deletion of \$529,000 for exploration and drilling but recommends the inclusion of \$500,000 for the oil-shale plant at Rifle, Colo.

For servicewide operations the committee recommends \$102,435,000—\$37,000 less than the amount recommended in the House bill, and \$73,000 less than the budget estimate. The Navy had included in this appropriation request funds for furnishing six sets of flag officers' quarters. The number of quarters was subsequently reduced to 3, and \$36,000 was deleted by the House. Since the remaining 3 sets of quarters have not as yet been approved by the Congress, the committee recommends a further reduction of \$37,000 from the bill for furnishing and maintenance of these quarters, on the grounds that they are not likely to be available for occupancy during the coming fiscal year.

That reference is to the quarters which are to be built on the Naval Observatory grounds off Massachusetts Avenue. Money was requested for furniture and equipment, when, as a matter of fact, the housing will not be completed during this year.

For all other Department of the Navy appropriations, the committee recommends the same amounts recommended in the House bill.

The sum of \$2,478,316,000 is provided for Navy military personnel. This should enable the Navy to support a military personnel strength for June 30, 1957, of 678,223.

The sum of \$647,100,000 is provided for Marine Corps military personnel. This will provide the Marine Corps with a

personnel strength of 205,735 for June 30, 1957.

For aircraft and related procurement in the Navy, \$1,732,900,000 is recommended, the same amount recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimate. These funds will provide for the procurement of almost 1,500 new aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps. This quantity, when combined with aircraft procured with prior year funds, will result in deliveries of approximately 2,000 aircraft per year through calendar year 1958. The funds recommended will enable the Navy to begin production engineering and procurement of long lead-time components and materials for two new models of aircraft in advance of their actual production. Additional funds will have to be provided in the 1958 budget to procure sufficient quantities of these particular models to permit accelerated test and evaluation. This procedure of concurrent design and production engineering should speed up the flow of modern aircraft to the Navy, and yet avoid cost by premature production orders.

For shipbuilding and conversion, the committee recommends a total of \$1,479,700,000—the same amount recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimate. This will finance the Navy's 1957 shipbuilding program, consisting of 23 ship, including a sixth *Forrestal* carrier, 12 destroyers and frigate guided-missile ships, 1 nuclear-powered guided-missile cruiser, and 6 nuclear-powered submarines, plus 4,629 tons of landing craft. It also includes the conversion and modernization of 22 ships, including 4 attack aircraft carriers, 5 guided-missile light cruisers, 1 amphibious assault ship, 1 attack transport, 1 seaplane tender, 6 radar picket escort vessels, and 4 ocean radar-station ships, together with about 16,000 tons of service and other small craft. The program also includes funds to commence design and advanced procurement of a powerplant for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier.

The committee recommends a total of \$95 million for Naval Reserve personnel and \$26,800,000 for Marine Corps Reserve personnel. This will provide the Naval Reserve with a total of 165,359 men in drill-pay status and the Marine Corps Reserve with a total of 60,060 by June 30, 1957. This is an increase of a little over 5,000 in the Naval Reserve and almost 10,000 in the Marine Corps Reserve during fiscal year 1957.

The committee recommends \$492 million for Navy research and development, a reduction of \$1 million from the budget estimate, but an increase of more than \$60 million over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1956. There is a difference of only \$1 million as between the budget estimate and the recommendation.

The reduction of \$1 million reflects an effort to force the Navy to screen out questionable projects in the so-called military-science program. The funds provided should enable the Navy to carry forward a vigorous program of research and development, particularly in the aircraft and guided missile fields.

I shall not discuss in detail the remaining Department of the Navy appropriations, except to say that the funds recommended by the committee should be fully adequate to carry forward the Navy program as presented to the Congress.

Mr. President, before I discuss the committee's recommendations for the Department of the Air Force, I should like to touch briefly on the committee action with regard to several other matters.

With respect to section 612: Scrap and salvage, the committee recommends an increase of \$22,500,000 in the limitation on funds expended for the preparation for sale and salvage of scrap and surplus materials, raising the amount from \$31 million to \$53,500,000. These funds are generated from receipts from the sale of scrap, salvage, and surplus materials. Receipts from the sale of surplus are included for the first time. It is the objective of the proposed section 612 to establish a single all-inclusive fund to finance the Department of Defense disposal program which heretofore had been financed from several sources. This increase in the limitation will permit the Department of Defense to put greater emphasis on the program for getting rid of old scrap, salvage, and surplus materials, thereby freeing warehouse space for other more useful purposes.

What the section actually does in practice is to provide that all the funds now being used for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps—for all agencies of the Department of Defense—shall be at the disposal of one particular agency, in a revolving fund, which will handle the whole matter. We believe it can be done better in that way, and that it will save the Government some money.

With respect to the Air Force industrial fund, the committee recommends the following provision:

During the fiscal year 1957 there is hereby authorized to be transferred to the Air Force industrial fund not to exceed \$40 million from the Navy industrial fund and not to exceed \$110 million from the Army industrial fund.

The committee deleted language provided by the House which would rescind these amounts from the respective accounts of the Army and Navy. The effect of this amendment would be to authorize the transfer of funds from the Army and Navy industrial funds to the Air Force industrial fund so as to enable the Air Force to place the Military Air Transport Service and eight major aircraft overhaul installations under industrial funding. The funds provided constitute the amount needed to finance the recoverable costs of work in process until the Air Force industrial fund can be reimbursed by the customer agencies. Various groups and commissions, including the Hoover Commission, which have studied Defense Department operations, have strongly urged the application of the industrial fund principle to these types of activities.

The committee feels the advantages to be gained by placing these activities under industrial funding are so great that no obstacles should be placed in the way of the early accomplishment of this objective.

In making this recommended change, however, the committee wishes to make it clear that the Department of Defense should, in the future, utilize the services of commercial transportation to the fullest extent possible when it is more economical; and that in evaluating relative costs of transportation the Department should recognize the element of time saved as an important factor.

The committee recommends the inclusion of the following new section—section 635, expense of development—requested by the Department of Defense:

Appropriations available to the Department of Defense for major procurement of aircraft and missiles shall be available for expenses of development.

The procurement appropriations of the military departments have for several years provided funds for financing development of items being procured and produced, although the language of these appropriations does not specifically cover such expenses. The expenditures for development being made from procurement appropriations are generally associated with the missiles program. In the interest of avoiding any delays in the program, because of technicalities, the foregoing amendment is recommended.

The proposal would involve no change from past and present practice concerning the use of the funds from the procurement appropriations for the development aspects associated with the procurement and production of missiles. The purpose would be to support present practices of using procurement funds for those portions of development which are inseparable from the production phase in the procurement of weapons.

With respect to the disposal of commercial activities, the committee has taken no action to restore section 638 of the 1956 act, which was identical to section 633 of this bill, as reported to the House.

This would have permitted committee action, either approving or disapproving, the disposal or transfer, by contract or otherwise, of work that for a period of 3 years or more has been performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense. However, the committee directs the Department of Defense to maintain all such facilities and activities within the Department, unless such disposal or transfer is economically justified, and unless no increased costs result. The Department of Defense is directed to report periodically to this committee on actions taken regarding such disposal or transfer.

The committee recommends for the Department of the Air Force a total of \$16,779,125,000—\$1,300,000,000 more than the amount provided by the House version of the bill, and \$1,112,625,000 more than the budget request.

These particular recommendations were the subject of considerable discussion in the committee. The majority view is that the Air Force program should be further accelerated, especially the buildup of the strategic long-range air forces. In order to receive firsthand information on this matter, the committee invited Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, the commanding general of the Strategic Air

Command, to appear before it. General LeMay made it very clear, in his testimony before the committee, that he did not consider the Air Force budget presented to the Congress fully adequate to the Nation's needs as he saw them.

It was the opinion of the majority of the committee, at least, that General LeMay, because he is in command of the Strategic Air Force is in a better position to tell the Congress and the country what is actually needed in order adequately to protect and safeguard the general welfare and defense of the United States than is anyone else of whom we know.

It was brought out in the hearings that the Air Force's fiscal year 1957 budget request contained about \$5 billion for SAC. The SAC forces proposed by General LeMay to the committee would according to his estimate, cost about \$8 billion per year, \$3 billion more than is contained in the fiscal year 1957 budget. Yet these are not the forces General LeMay thinks we require in order to maintain our air supremacy over the U. S. S. R. in 1960; rather they are the forces he believes we can attain without resorting to what he calls extraordinary measures.

General LeMay told the committee:

The principal requirements for support of this force are, first, a portion of the force must be maintained on a continuous combat alert. This means more people on a proved experience level and special facilities designed for this function. Simpler, more rugged bombs will also be necessary. Second, the force must be dispersed to the extent that managerial efficiency will permit. This means more bases. Third, the security of the force requires a communications and control system, both rapid and foolproof. This system must tie all elements of the Strategic Air Command, the Continental Air Defense Command, and the highest national authorities into one common net. Fourth, the maximum number of nonstrategic Air Command military air bases and civil airfields must be made compatible with Strategic Air Command aircraft for emergency use. Every airfield we develop under the minimum standards for Strategic Air Command use increases our flexibility and complicates the Soviet task. Fifth, research and development must be urgently pressed on the successor to the B-52, on missiles and on other aids which will enhance our ability to penetrate enemy defenses. We must have a modernized force in being to meet each new threat as it develops.

In brief, General LeMay says he needs more modern aircraft, more bases, more highly trained people, and more research and development.

The committee recognizes that more money alone will not provide all that General LeMay requires; but to the extent that it would help in maintaining our air superiority over the U. S. S. R., it should be provided. The committee recognizes that since 1945, the greatest single deterrent to war has been the strength of the United States Air Force, together with its possession of nuclear weapons. If we are to believe the experts, today the United States is in danger of falling behind in the development and production of the means to deliver this "greatest single deterrent."

The amendments totaling \$1 billion 160 million which have been added to the Air Force portion of this bill are the

committee's answer to this threat. That is the answer of the committee, and I think it is the answer that the American people would give to this threat.

We do not hold that this additional sum will prevent war any more than the lack of it will bring on a conflict. But we do believe that we dare not, we must not gamble on the security of our way of life, on the very existence of our Nation by hamstringing the production of our most effective weapons. This committee, this Congress, cannot produce B-52 bombers and modern fighters. Nor can it do the research necessary to produce the weapons of the future to counterbalance those being produced by other nations. But we can provide the funds necessary to do this, and we can alert the people of this Nation to the dangers of falling behind in production, in research, in development, of those weapons and those systems without which we might well become a second-rate airpower.

There may be those who would wish to muddy our thinking by referring to the single-weapon fallacy. Let me say right now that I am not one who believes that through airpower alone we can remain invincible. Our Army, our Navy, and our Marine Corps are an integral part of our defense team. We could never win a war or hope to keep the peace without them.

Nor am I one who is forgetful of the tremendous costs of this preparedness. How much better it would be if we could reduce our Armed Forces to a real peacetime basis, refrain from spending these billions upon billions for armament, and instead pour our energies entirely into making this country, this world, a better place in which to live.

But we must constantly remember that this expense is small when balanced against the frightful costs of war—not only in money, but in the men, women, and children who might well be obliterated, vaporized, in the conflict—and in the exhaustion of our natural resources, and our moral fiber, so precious if we are to continue to develop this great Nation.

And so the majority of our committee has recommended the addition of \$1,160,000,000 to this bill, divided into 5 appropriation titles: \$800 million for aircraft; \$200 million for base construction; \$100 million for research and development; \$40 million for operation and maintenance; and \$20 million for personnel.

I shall speak of each of these briefly in turn as I come to them.

Specifically, the committee recommends, for aircraft and related procurement, a total of \$6,848,500,000—\$800 million more than the amount recommended in both the House bill and the budget estimate. These additional funds are to be used primarily for increasing the production of heavy bombers for the Strategic Air Command. At the same time, should it be deemed advisable, part of these funds may be used to increase the production of fighter aircraft for the continental defense.

For procurement other than aircraft, the committee recommends \$1,177,000,000—\$77 million more than recommended in the House bill but the same

amount contained in the budget estimate. In restoring the \$77 million deleted by the House, the committee took cognizance of Air Force testimony to the effect that these funds were required to finance certain additional budgetary requirements which were not included in the budget submission. These requirements were for the acceleration of the air defense missile program, increases in support equipment for missile programs, modification and alignment of training equipment with recent changes in aircraft programs, additional equipment, equipment for the western extension of the distant early warning line, and increased equipment costs for SAGE, and the DEW line. These requirements the Air Force estimates will far exceed the \$77 million restored by the committee.

Ask the average member of the American public if he would like to have that much insurance for the protection of his country. We are willing to rest our case on that basis.

For research and development, the committee recommends \$710 million—\$100 million more than the amount recommended in the House bill and contained in the budget estimate. Sufficient evidence was adduced in testimony before the committee to indicate that additional funds could very profitably be used in the research and development program of the Air Force.

Although Air Force Secretary Quarles indicated that he considered the Air Force budget request for research and development "an austere but satisfactory level, requiring further very careful study," General Twining made it clear that he felt the Air Force could profitably use additional funds in that area. What does "an austere but satisfactory level" mean? It means a tightening. It means a squeezing of the pocketbook. In these days when our Government gives \$4 billion for foreign aid, some persons whimper about \$100 million being appropriated for research and development for the protection of the country.

General Callahan, the Air Force Assistant for Programming, also stated:

In my judgment, we could usefully obligate on the order of \$150 million to \$200 million more during fiscal year 1957 in research and development.

The \$100 million proposed for research and development is recommended because the high priority projects such as ballistic missiles and atom power aircraft are using such a large part of the research dollars available to the Air Force that many other important worthwhile projects are being squeezed out of the program or inadequately financed, thereby reducing our technical leadership in many areas.

For operations and maintenance, the committee recommends a total of \$3,780,185,000, an increase of \$96 million over the amount recommended in the House bill, but \$5,815,000 less than the budget estimate. As in the case of the Army, the Air Force budget estimate for operations and maintenance contained \$45,815,000 in lieu of deutschmark support. Excluding this item, the committee recommendation actually adds \$40 million to the budget estimate. This \$40 million has been added to the bill to sup-

port the increased operational and force buildup. In addition the committee recommends restoration of \$56 million deleted by the House, as requested by the Air Force. This will permit the Air Force to support approved activities and force buildup which are essential to meet approved program objectives.

Specifically, the \$56 million will provide \$30 million for aviation fuel and oil, \$6 million for logistic support, \$15 million for operational support, \$4 million for training support, and \$1 million for servicewide support.

For military personnel, the committee recommends a total of \$3,745,440,000, which is \$27 million more than the amount recommended in the House bill, and \$18,440,000 more than the budget estimate. Excluding \$1,560,000 included in the budget estimate in lieu of deutschmark support, the committee recommendations actually add \$20 million to the budget estimate.

The Air Force testified that restoration of \$7 million is necessary in order to reassign and deploy military personnel on a permanent change of station basis in order to accomplish the required manning of the additional six wings and support units planned for activation during the fiscal year 1957. The increase of \$20 million is provided for additional personnel needed to implement an augmented Air Force.

The committee also recommends language similar to that contained in Senate Document 127 be included in the bill. This would permit the utilization of \$57,853,000 of the 1957 appropriation to pay obligations incurred under this head in fiscal 1956. It was testified that the additional sum is required to cover unanticipated increases in certain personnel costs associated with a larger number of reenlistments than previously estimated. Unless additional funds are supplied, increased costs cannot be met without reducing the planned level of personnel.

The committee recommends a total of \$59,300,000 for Air Force Reserve personnel and \$253,700,000 for the Air National Guard. These are the same amounts recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimates. These funds will provide for a total of 67,980 men in drill pay status in the Air National Guard and 99,685 in the Air Force Reserve.

The committee recommends an appropriation at this time of \$200 million for "Military construction, Air Force," in order to provide, at the earliest possible time, needed funds for the construction of bases required for the proper operation of the larger aircraft. Total military construction requests for fiscal year 1957 for the Air Force amount to \$1,228,000,000 and have not yet been acted upon by the Congress. In recommending an immediate appropriation of \$200 million, the committee is acting on the assumption that a like amount will be deducted from the appropriation request for military construction in the supplemental appropriation bill, 1957. The net effect of this action is to make construction funds available to the Air Force earlier than would otherwise be possible, to be utilized in accordance with the recommendations contained in the justifica-

tion already submitted to our committee and to the House Appropriations Committee.

We wished to give them that much lead time, and probably when the appropriations for construction are made in the supplemental appropriation bill, this amount will be deducted from the total appropriated for the Air Force for that purpose.

It will permit the Air Force to proceed immediately with construction for the dispersal of the SAC forces, the construction needed for the ballistic missiles program and for certain classified projects which are of great importance to the United States. Making these funds available now will permit contracting at an early date and start on the projects this fall and avoid a delay in these projects until next spring, which would be the case if the Air Force was required to wait for the passage of the regular public-works appropriations bill.

Mr. President, the committee, in recommending appropriations of this great magnitude, almost \$35 billion, excluding—except for \$200 million—funds for military construction, fully recognizes the financial burden imposed on the American people. But the Congress has a responsibility, not only to guard the public purse, but also to guard the Nation's security.

The cost of national defense is unavoidably increasing, primarily because of the increasing costs of new weapons. Practically every new item of equipment procured for our military forces costs considerably more, sometimes 2 or 3 times more than the item it replaces. Yet it is only by developing, producing, and integrating these new weapons into our military forces as rapidly as feasible that we can continue to assure our national security in an increasingly dangerous world.

Clearly, under these circumstances, greater economy and efficiency in the management of the Defense Establishment is an absolute necessity. Numerous examples of duplication have been forcibly brought to the attention of the committee. In some cases, the committee believes this duplication borders on unconscionable waste of the country's resources, not only in materials, but in land resources, manpower, and money.

The committee recognizes that in limited areas of research and development, certain parallel research efforts will unavoidably be necessary for the sake of rapid progress. The committee is also aware that healthy competition among the services is desirable. But the committee expresses deep concern over duplication of functions and facilities among the services which tend to reduce the overall effectiveness of our military effort.

The committee is well aware that the Congress cannot legislate departmental economy. It is also aware that this Nation cannot expect a balanced economy unless and until officials charged with the responsibility for these vast spending programs make a renewed effort to curtail nonessential expenditures.

Within the Department of Defense, unification of the armed services must

be made a fact, and the joint use of existing facilities where feasible must be made mandatory. Construction of new facilities should be initiated only when existing facilities are fully utilized.

Mr. President, the bill which is now before the Senate provides the funds necessary to support the size and kind of forces needed to assure the peace and security of the United States in the years to come.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, first I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico for his excellent description of the action taken by the committee. As one who listened to most of the testimony and studied the evidence submitted to the committee, I would say that his statement covers very clearly the action of the committee.

It is my understanding that the committee was unanimous, with the exception of several items concerning the Air Force. I should like to bring out that fact, if I may, at the present time, so as to develop what the issues are as between the majority and the minority of the committee. The differences all relate to the Air Force.

In the committee the distinguished Senator from New Mexico offered an amendment which would have increased the budget estimates on certain aircraft items, to wit, aircraft and procurement, research and development, operation and maintenance, personnel, and military construction, by a total of \$1,160 million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The total consists of the sums of \$800 million, \$200 million, \$100 million, \$40 million, and \$20 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. There is \$200 million for an advance on construction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That amendment was adopted in committee by a vote of 13 to 12. Afterward, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, submitted an amendment on the floor of the Senate, of which I and several other Senators are sponsors, which would reduce the amounts proposed to be appropriated by the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, as follows:

Aircraft and related procurement. The amount recommended by the Senator from New Mexico is \$800 million additional. The amount provided by the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire is \$350 million. There is a difference of \$450 million.

For research and development, the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico provides an increase of \$100 million over the estimate of the Budget Bureau, and the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire carries the same figure.

For operation and maintenance, the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico provides \$40 million, and the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire provides \$30 million. So there is a difference of \$10 million there.

For personnel, the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico provides \$20 million, and the Bridges amendment provides \$20 million. The amounts are the same.

For military construction, the Senator from New Mexico would provide \$200 million now, while the Senator from New Hampshire would strike out the amendment and allow it to come up in the regular construction bill.

So that, boiled down, the committee was unanimous except as to the three items, namely, aircraft and related procurement, where there is a difference of \$450 million; operation and maintenance, where there is a difference of \$10 million; and the question of whether any military construction money shall be included in this bill or whether it shall be considered in a later bill.

Does the Senator from New Mexico agree with me that the issues, as we see them, concern those three items?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Unless some individual Member of the Senate has an amendment which he wishes to offer, there is no other difference of opinion?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The only differences are between the \$800 million in my amendment and the \$350 million in the Bridges amendment, the difference of \$10 million with reference to operation and maintenance, and the difference of \$200 million in construction.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator, and I appreciate his statement this afternoon, to which I have listened with attention, following him as he finished reading his pages, because of the details involved.

I hope to have a few remarks of my own to make on the general subject, either tomorrow or on Monday. But I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts, and I wish to assure the Senate that the members of the Committee on Appropriations, both the subcommittee and the full committee, on both sides of the so-called political line, were at all times most cooperative. I do not believe any politics was involved, whatsoever.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sure the Senator is correct. There was simply a difference of opinion as to whether we should try to advance the time for building a greater number of aircraft.

Mr. CHAVEZ. One redeeming feature, as I think my good friend from Massachusetts will agree with me, is that a supplemental bill will carry the construction items. When military construction is dealt with in the supplemental bill, I would be willing to go along with the Senator from Massachusetts in deducting this amount from that bill. The only reason why I think it is necessary now is to gain a little time during the construction season.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that the Air Force needs the full amount of construction money covered by the estimate.

That amount, if my memory is correct, is \$1,228,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. What difference would it make if we granted this much extra time during the construction months? In a few months it will be getting cold in many places.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We should also make sure that we know what projects are authorized and on what projects we are going to allow money to be spent, rather than to put \$200 million into construction now, even though it may have been authorized in the past.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think it would be a good principle if we handled all these items in one bill, because they can cover a multitude of sins by the time the supplemental bill is taken up. It is usually said that the projects were not ready at the time of the regular appropriation bill. I think it would be a good, sound principle to put them in the regular bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from New Mexico has had much experience in these matters. I again commend him for his thoughtful statement and for the courtesy and patience with which he conducted the hearings during the past few weeks.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

DISPERSION OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Government of the United States maintains a sound policy of dispersion with respect to defense industries. I think, in part, that policy, perhaps, ought to be constantly subject to review, but it has been carefully arrived at and, from time to time, has been amended. The people of the United States believe in the wisdom of a sound policy of dispersion of defense industries.

Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will debate H. R. 9852 which provides for certain amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1950. I very much regret that an amendment has been submitted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] which, if adopted, would write into the defense production bill a statement with respect to the congressional policy of dispersion, a statement, which, in my judgment, has not been carefully considered, and which would create confusion. It completely avoids inclusion of many of the carefully drawn criteria which the Office of Defense Mobilization has prepared in the present dispersal order. Indeed, Mr. President, the Department of Defense, speaking through the Department of the Air Force, has registered its objection to the so-called geographic dispersal amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

In connection with tomorrow's debate I wish the Members of the Senate to have readily available to them a copy of the present Federal order with respect to dispersal. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Defense Mobilization Order No. 1-19, issued by the Office of Defense Mobilization and signed by Arthur S. Flemming, Director, be printed in full in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION—DEFENSE MOBILIZATION ORDER I-19

Subject: Dispersion and Protective Construction—Policy, Criteria, Responsibilities.

By virtue of the authority vested in me pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; Reorganization Plan No. 3, effective June 12, 1953; and the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; the following policy, criteria, and assignment of responsibilities for dispersion and protective construction are promulgated:

1. Policy: It is the policy of the United States to encourage and, when appropriate, to require that new facilities and major expansions of existing facilities important to national security be located, insofar as practicable, so as to reduce the risk of damage in the event of attack; and to encourage and, when appropriate, require the incorporation of protective construction features in new and existing facilities to provide resistance to weapons effects suitable to the locations of said facilities.

2. Criteria:

(a) The distance of a facility from the probable area of destruction is the controlling factor in reducing the risk of attack damage to such facility. In determining the appropriate distance consideration will be given to all relevant factors, including:

(1) The most likely objects or targets of enemy attack, such as certain military, industrial, population, and governmental concentrations.

(2) The size of such targets.

(3) The destructive power of a large yield weapon or weapons suitable to the particular target.

(4) The gradation of pressures and thermal radiation at various distances from an assumed point of detonation.

(5) The characteristics of the proposed facility, including underground and built-in protective construction features, with respect to its resistance to nuclear, chemical, and unconventional weapons.

(6) The degree of damage which a facility could sustain and still remain operable.

(7) The ground environment or natural barriers which might provide added protection to the facility.

(8) The economic, operational, and administrative requirements in carrying out the function for which the facility is to be provided.

b. While no single distance standard and no single set of protective construction specifications against nuclear, chemical, and unconventional weapons are feasible for all situations, the above factors will be applied so as to achieve the most protection practicable for a specific situation.

3. Responsibilities:

(a) All departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government are responsible for adherence to the policy and criteria herein set forth with respect to programs under their control. Without limitation, specific reference is made to the following:

(1) All agencies: (a) Programs for minimizing the vulnerability of the mobilization base (DMO-I-4, paragraph 17); (b) consideration of dispersed location and protective construction in the review of application for tax amortization (DMO-III-1, paragraphs 4 and 5; DMO-VI-4); (c) application of dispersion standards to facilities of the executive branch, in accordance with policy and standards issued by Director, Office of Defense Mobilization.

(2) Department of Defense: Programs for maximum use of dispersed plants, and de-

velopment of standards for strategic locations and physical security. (DMO-I-12, par. 2 (g) (h) and (o).)

(3) Department of the Interior: Programs for continuity of production of certain assigned industries. (DMO-I-13, par. 2 (j).)

(4) Department of Agriculture: Programs for operation of vital food facilities. (DMO-I-9, par. 2 (h).)

(5) Department of Commerce: Programs for dispersion and continuity of production. (DMO-I-8, par. 2 (g) and (h).)

(6) Federal Civil Defense Administration: Development and coordination of plans and programs for the reduction of urban vulnerability. (DMO-I-18.)

(b) The Department of Commerce (Office of Area Development) is responsible for providing guidance and assistance to departments and agencies of the Federal Government, to industry, public and private persons and organizations including local dispersion committees, in the application of the policy and criteria contained herein.

(1) By agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of Commerce, Department of Defense will provide guidance on certain industrial and other nonmilitary projects in which it has a direct and special interest.

(2) The Department of Commerce may make similar arrangements with other departments and agencies to provide guidance on projects in which they have a direct and special interest, provided that reasonable safeguards to assure consistency and uniformity in the application of the policy and standards are maintained.

(3) The Department of Defense is responsible for the application of this policy to military projects without consultation with the Department of Commerce, but with due regard to the location of other vital facilities and plans for reduction of urban vulnerability as developed by the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

(c) The Federal Civil Defense Administration, responsible for the development and coordination of plans and programs for the reduction of urban vulnerability, is responsible for integrating at the metropolitan target zone level dispersion actions with all other measures which can make urban areas less attractive targets. It is also responsible for promulgating construction standards and specifications for the protection of persons and property from nuclear and unconventional weapons effects. The Department of Commerce and all others concerned will be governed by such standards in rendering the guidance and assistance described in paragraph b, above.

4. Decisions: This order supersedes the dispersion policy statement of August 10, 1951.

5. This order is effective immediately.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, Director.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I very much hope the Members of the Senate will study that order and then contrast it with the language contained in House bill 9852 which will be before the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 4 of House bill 9852 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my marks.

There being no objection, section 4 of House bill 9852 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 2 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In order to insure productive capacity in the event of such an attack on the United States, it is the policy of the Congress to promote the geographical dispersal of the

industrial facilities of the United States in the interest of the national defense, and to discourage the concentration of such productive facilities within limited geographical areas which are vulnerable to attack by an enemy of the United States. In the construction of any Government-owned industrial facilities, in the rendition of any Government financial assistance for the construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facilities, and in the procurement of goods and services, under this or any other act, each department and agency of the Executive Branch shall apply, under the coordination of the Office of Defense Mobilization, when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy, the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense. Nothing contained in this paragraph shall preclude the use of existing industrial facilities.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, tomorrow I shall object to the provision of the House bill with respect to dispersion. I shall do so because the provision is not well considered and because it does not spell out the entire criteria which was spelled out by the Government of the United States in its order. If it is the wish and desire of Congress to pass judgment on a sound dispersal policy, then I commend the present order of the Office of Defense Mobilization to their attention.

FREE OR REDUCED RATE FOR AIR TRANSPORTATION OF MINISTERS OF RELIGION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (b) of section 403 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following sentence: "Any air carrier or foreign air carrier, under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, may grant reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion, except that such a carrier may not grant such reduced-rate transportation during any period with respect to which it receives any compensation, determined under section 406 of this act, which is payable by the Board pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit air carriers and foreign air carriers, subject to certain conditions, to grant reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SCHOEPFEL, and Mr. PAYNE conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that, in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate now stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, June 22, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 21, 1956:

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION

Howard H. Shannon, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection, vice James H. Friend, resigning.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Richard E. Robinson, of Nebraska, to be United States district judge for the district of Nebraska, vice James A. Donohoe, deceased.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Prof. Thomas Dodson Stamps, O8560, United States Military Academy, for appointment as Dean of the Academic Board of the United States Military Academy, under the provisions of an act of Congress adopted June 26, 1946 (Public Law 449, 79th Cong.).

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown, O16761, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Morgan Watlington, O16780, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Leander LaChance Doan, O16839, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Willis Small Matthews, O16932, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Gerald Edward Galloway, O16043, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. William Clyde Baker, Jr., O16371, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Clerin Rodney Smith, O16388, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bertram Arthur Holtzworth, O16804, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Herbert John Vander Heide, O17754, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18157, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Phillips Daley, O18358, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Theodore William Parker, O18369, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Orlando Collette Troxel, Jr., O18487, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Rush Blodget Lincoln, Jr., O18656, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Floyd Allan Hansen, O18767, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Alexander McNair Willing, O38619, United States Army.

Col. James Harvey Cash 2d, O38628, United States Army.

Col. Charles Coburn Smith, Jr., O18434, United States Army.

Col. John Joseph Davis, O18530, United States Army.

Col. Curtis James Herrick, O18538, United States Army.

Col. Richard Steinbach, O18560, United States Army.

Col. John Edward Leary, O18607, United States Army.

Col. Hal Cushman Pattison, O29683, United States Army.

Col. John Henry Weber, O18680, United States Army.

Col. Kenneth Frederick Zitzman, O18694, United States Army.

Col. Frank Hamilton Britton, O18703, United States Army.

Col. Edwin Simpson Hartshorn, Jr., O18716, United States Army.

Col. Stephen Michael Mellnik, O18754, United States Army.

Col. Charles Salvatore D'Orsa, O18866, United States Army.

Col. Loris Ray Cochran, O18889, United States Army.

Col. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, O18968, United States Army.

Col. John Gardner Shinkle, O18979, United States Army.

Col. Chester Arthur Dahlen, O19020, United States Army.

Col. George Warren White, O19079, United States Army.

Col. Edgar Collins Doleman, O19131, United States Army.

Col. Charles Francis Tank, O19350, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Stanley Robert Larsen, O22094, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be colonels

Adams, Robert H., O19474.

Alexander, David C., Jr., O39901.

Allen, Chester F., O30060.

Amoroso, Leonard, O30076.

Andersen, Hal P., O39920.

Anderson, Chester H., O30096.

Anderson, Townsend C., O30195.

Andrae, Herbert H., O19546.

Andrews, Charles L., O19363.

Armstrong, Donald K., O18578.

Bahr, Robert C., O19470.

Baker, Elverson E., O30183.

Baker, Robert G., O19427.

Baker, Samuel E., O42395.

Barber, Keith H., O39606.

Barry, George W., O39916.

Beauchamp, Edwin LeP., O51444.

Beck, Vancel R., O30233.

Bender, Thomas W., O30162.

Bergmann, John A., O42300.

Berkowitz, Charles J., O39854.

Betts, Austin W., O19373.

Bilbo, Theodore G., Jr., O19477.

Billings, William H., O30098.

Blair, Robert K., O51526.

Blankenship, Francis R., O42330.

Blaser, Eugene V., O42364.

Blencoe, Guy M., O30245.

Bochnowski, Joseph S., O51498.

Bollero, Angelo D., O39853.

Bolton, Cecil H., O39870.

Booth, James W., O26382.

Bowers, Mervin C., O42319.

Boyd, Lawrence L., O30180.

Boyd, Marzelle F., O39921.

Breckenridge, James D. C., O39897.

Brittain, Courtland F., O42341.

Brogan, William T., O30194.

Brookhart, Harold C., O19562.

Brown, Charles E., O19552.

Brown, Harry E., Jr., O39900.

Brown, Percival S., O19487.

Brown, Staunton L., O19356.

Brown, Travis T., O19574.

Browning, Harold W., O19545.

Brownlee, Lorraine H., O17583.

Brubaker, Elbridge L., O51445.

Bruce, Burton E., O19360.

Bucher, John C., O51494.

Bunker, William B., O19402.

Buser, Oscar C., O42246.

Bush, Howard C., O30205.

Butler, James J., O30068.

Campbell, William M., O42337.

Cantey, James, O30019.

Carson, Eugene J., O51446.

Caulfield, Frank J., O19515.

Caughron, James W., O51513.

Chandler, Fitzhugh H., O42328.

Chapman, Rubert D., O42367.

Chatfield, Miles B., O19404.

Cheston, D. Murray, 3d, O19507.

Claps, Luigi F., O39855.

Clark, Harold F., O30040.

Clem, Rhoman E., O51457.

Clinebell, Glenn L., O30109.

Coffman, George W., Jr., O42293.

Coleman, James C., Jr., O30053.

Cook, Dave J., O30051.

Cook, Fredric C., O19484.

Corey, Harold L., O56814.

Coward, Raymond, O51495.

Cowles, Harper B., O51515.

Cox, Weldon W., O51453.

Craig, William H., O19526.

Crane, George E., O42377.

Cromwell, Jack O., O42346.

Culbertson, Eual W., O42263.

Culley, Frank J., O30117.

Cunin, Kenneth A., O19481.

Cunningham, William A., 3d, O19579.

Curtin, Edwin P., O30231.

Daehler, Raymond E., O42304.

Dale, John R., O39857.

Dame, Hartley F., O51487.

Darrah, John W., Jr., O19473.

Darrah, Raymond W., O30029.

Davall, Harold C., O19425.

Davin, John H., O42253.

Davis, Kermit LeV., O19386.

Day, John F., Jr., O51502.

Deagle, Edwin A., O30237.

Decker, Nelson I., O30105.

DeGuire, Merlin L., O19446.

DeJarnette, James T., O42344.

DeMarr, James D., O42273.

Devaney, Carl N., O38770.

Dorsey, Robert E., O30100.

Dow, Donald G., O42389.

Eales, John I. H., O38751.

Echols, Leonard E., O42265.

Edson, Hallett D., O19541.

Edwards, William H., O42267.

Elliott, Charles B., Jr., O19490.

Evans, Albert B., O30215.

Feindel, William B., Jr., O30177.

Fell, Charles F., O19368.

Fellenz, Lloyd E., O19485.

Field, Winston L., O39869.

Fillmore, Robert H., O30254.

Fincher, Joe LeR., O30145.

Finn, John W., O30257.

Foote, Thomas C., O19488.

Forbes, Merwin B., O30097.
 Foster, James E., O30256.
 Franklin, John F., Jr., O19476.
 Franklin, John M., O39864.
 Frick, John E., O42303.
 Fuller, William H. G., O19190.
 Gambrill, Robert E., O39716.
 Georges, Michael P., O42242.
 Gerhart, George H., O19569.
 Gifford, Gerald K., O51539.
 Gilman, Seymour I., O19377.
 Glen, George R., O30049.
 Gooch, Stacy W., O19455.
 Goodhand, Oscar G., O51511.
 Goodloe, Mason F., O30161.
 Gould, Karl T., O19544.
 Grenelle, Edwin W., O38757.
 Grenier, William T., O30167.
 Guimond, Joseph A., O26379.
 Hamilton, J. Arthur, O42294.
 Hammonds, Vernon, O51486.
 Harkins, Basil A., O51015.
 Harper, James E., Jr., O42404.
 Harrelson, Elmer H., O42350.
 Harton, Thomas G., O42385.
 Hatfield, Ralph H., O39755.
 Hattox James G., O30253.
 Haycraft, Kenneth C., O29704.
 Hayden, Robert H., O42356.
 Hayes, Thomas H., O19556.
 Hein, Neil F., O51467.
 Henderson, William P., O51483.
 Hess, Bule, O42379.
 Heyne, Daniel H., O19493.
 Higgins, Roger E., O39867.
 Hillyard, Harry L., O19524.
 Himes, Donald S., O30224.
 Himes, William J., O19365.
 Hines, Clifford C., O42289.
 Hoehne, Ervin D. K., O39878.
 Hoff, Stuart S., O38766.
 Hoffman, Theodore F., O19403.
 Holly, Leo V., O42420.
 Hood, Lund F., O39892.
 Horton, Russell H., O30125.
 Howard, Claude M., O19464.
 Howell, William C., Jr., O30085.
 Hubbard, Harry J., O19459.
 Huneycutt, Robert E., O29946.
 Hunt, Lewis A., O39889.
 Hurst, Richard M., O30191.
 Jablonsky, Harvey J., O19390.
 Jackson, William F., O51529.
 James, George W., O30146.
 Jeffery, Arthur B., O30201.
 Jenna, Russell W., O19564.
 Johnson, Charles E., 3d, O19534.
 Johnson, Leonard M., O42329.
 Johnson, William G., O38756.
 Johnston, Dana W., Jr., O19506.
 Jones, Thornton E., O30214.
 Kabrich, Charles E., O39856.
 Kelleher, Gerald C., O38750.
 Kenerick, Kenneth R., O19452.
 Kent, Frederick T., Jr., O30172.
 Kern, Truman H., O42309.
 Kern, William B., O19566.
 Keyes, Lewis H., O38765.
 Killian, Joseph O., O19370.
 Knowlton, Stewart H., O30159.
 Kuster, John F., O42419.
 Kyser, Robert C., O19535.
 Lambert, Joe C., O30033.
 Lane, Danna L., O51520.
 Lardin, Harry E., O19494.
 Larnier, Thomas M., O30223.
 Lawlor, John D., O19536.
 Lee, John K., Jr., O30136.
 Leigh, Beverly M., Jr., O39917.
 Levin, Maurice, O39912.
 Lewis, Donald L., O30119.
 Limoncelli, Donald D., O42375.
 Lipscomb, Thomas H., O19371.
 Long, Homer E., O30176.
 Longacre, Terrance M., O30047.
 Lucke, Emil A., O42331.
 Luke, Regis W., O39859.
 Lynn, Clark, Jr., O19456.
 MacDonnell, Robert G., O19361.
 Mack, Daniel D., Jr., O30015.
 MacLeod, John W., O41919.
 MacWillie, Donald MacG., O30152.

Maddox, Edward R., O30036.
 Maiorano, Pasquale P., O42316.
 Manlove, Almon W., O19413.
 Markley, Harrison M., O38752.
 Martin, Lewis T., O30188.
 Martin, Ronald Lev., O19428.
 Mathewson, David A., Jr., O38753.
 McBride, Robert J., O30216.
 McCrary, Thomas A., O19570.
 McDonald, William J., O30169.
 McElroy, Arvine W., O30093.
 McGovern, John P., O42391.
 McGowan, Glenn J., O42353.
 McKee, Richard L., O19453.
 McLennan, Donald G., O19475.
 McPheron, Donald A., O19555.
 McReil, Donald W., O29606.
 Meetze, Adam W., O30087.
 Mennie, Merle L., O39880.
 Merritt, Anthony G., O42255.
 Messner, Arthur E., O30181.
 Metcalf, James F., O42288.
 Miller, Arles H., O42287.
 Miller, Eugene E., O30156.
 Miller, James R., O51472.
 Miller, Lee C., O19438.
 Miller, Leland V., O30235.
 Miller, Robert B., O19366.
 Minot, Charles A., O42335.
 Mize, Willard W., O30204.
 Moffett, Clewis C., O39909.
 Moore, Elmore P., O51460.
 Moore, Lowrey R., O29941.
 Moorman, Frank W., O19444.
 Moorman, Richard R., O19394.
 Mossman, Albert P., O19469.
 Mouk, Robert McF., O42368.
 Mullen, Carroll C., O51456.
 Mullen, William J., Jr., O19586.
 Murphy, William J., O30222.
 Murray, Roy A., O42366.
 Neel, John S., O51493.
 Neilson, Henry, O19588.
 Nelson, Herbert L., O30232.
 Newman, Erman M., O30173.
 Nida, Glenn E., O30140.
 Nooncaster, Clifton F., O30061.
 Northam, William F., O19547.
 Norton, George E., Jr., O42262.
 Norvell, Frank C., O19471.
 Nutt, James D., O30164.
 O'Connell, Edward M., O19563.
 O'Neill, Larry J., O38761.
 O'Neill, Thomas A., O19583.
 O'Neill, John T., O30166.
 Orsino, Guy A., O30168.
 Osborne, Eric R., O42299.
 Osborne, Hugh P., O30151.
 Painter, Brookman R., O38754.
 Parnelle, Samuel W., Jr., O29501.
 Parry, Robert C., O39908.
 Pearson, Harold J., O42418.
 Peca, Peter S., O19392.
 Penat, Edward F., O29598.
 Perez, Gines, O30126.
 Petty, Travis L., O19439.
 Phillips, Stanley W., O42407.
 Piram, Joseph S., O19411.
 Pitzer, John M., O26378.
 Pochyla, Benjamin H., O30103.
 Pond, Leon O., O42412.
 Preston, Walter J., Jr., O42388.
 Pritchard, William J., O42258.
 Ranney, Daniel A., O39863.
 Rasor, Sam J., O38769.
 Rathbone, John V., Jr., O42424.
 Rathje, Theodore A., O42311.
 Ray, Claude E., O51430.
 Reed, Albert L., O42380.
 Rehmann, Edward L., O30027.
 Reifsnnyder, Harold R., O39881.
 Revie, Charles R., O19369.
 Richardson, Joseph M., O42269.
 Riddlehuber, Walter R., O39902.
 Rinker, Cornelius J., O30129.
 Rique, Donald P., O39874.
 Roelofs, Thomas B., O38764.
 Rogers, Thomas DeF., O19351.
 Routh, David B., O19437.
 Rusteberg, Edwin, O19542.
 Ryan, Charles F., O30213.
 Sabine, John S., O39860.

Saenz, Ralph, O38762.
 Sames, Harry B., O42167.
 Sanders, Donald A., O51489.
 Sanders, Horace L., O19445.
 Sandin, Ramon A., O39884.
 Schepp, David G., O42382.
 Seaman, Jonathan O., O19385.
 Seitz, John A., O30137.
 Seymour, Willard R., O38772.
 Shaw, Millard, O42313.
 Shaw, Walter A., O42343.
 Shoemaker, John J., O30133.
 Simenson, Clifford G., O19511.
 Smith, Dana E., O38759.
 Smith, Joseph V., O30030.
 Smith, Lynn D., O29741.
 Smith, Merwin H., O42349.
 Smith, Stillson H., Jr., O19480.
 Smith, William A., O30079.
 Smoller, John F., O19416.
 Snee, James W., O19516.
 Sonneman, Otto F., Jr., O42280.
 Spillman, William R., O42345.
 Spinney, Russell G., O30054.
 Spivy, Berton E., Jr., O19479.
 Stanley, Charles A., O30118.
 Stanley, John B., O19549.
 Stark, Henry J., O51448.
 Stein, John F., O51538.
 Stevens, John DuV., O19414.
 Stewart, Marion G., Jr., O30244.
 Stiebel, Henry M., O30198.
 Street, Frank L., O30055.
 Surratt, Joe F., O19461.
 Swartz, Robert N., O39903.
 Sylvester, Robert W., O51473.
 Tank, Charles F., O19350.
 Tate, Ferdinand J., O19359.
 Taylor, Glenn R., O42387.
 Tennant, Richard S., O51474.
 Thomas, Evert S., Jr., O30107.
 Thrift, Richard E., O39849.
 Trall, Harry E., O30206.
 Tribe, Merrill LeR., O42374.
 Troth, James R., O42270.
 True, Gerald F., O38773.
 Turner, John R., O39899.
 Tyson, Robert N., O19594.
 Usera, Vincent, O39883.
 Vail, Bruce H., O51533.
 VanDine, William H., O30032.
 Villere, Lewis G., O42520.
 Vining, Osmyn A., O42398.
 Voehl, Wilford E. H., O19382.
 Volckmann, Russell W., O19537.
 Walitschek, Kurt L., O42241.
 Walsh, James E., O19372.
 Walsh, Louis A., Jr., O19567.
 Walt, Ivan O., O42286.
 Ward, Nathaniel P., 3d, O19553.
 Warren, Robert B., O19380.
 Waugh, William H., Jr., O19587.
 Webb, Robert L., O30207.
 Weber, Richard E., Jr., O19421.
 Wehrle, Awtry P., O51017.
 Wellendorf, Leonard E., O29538.
 White, Charles H., Jr., O19407.
 White, Edward L., O39885.
 Whitson, Ray W., O30056.
 Williams, John A., O42257.
 Williams, Urquhart P., O19391.
 Williamson, Carl E., O30178.
 Willoughby, William H., O30108.
 Wingo, Charles A., O51451.
 Winn, James R., O19491.
 Wobbeking, Bernard, O42417.
 Wolfe, Yale H., O19415.
 Wood, Charles H., O19498.
 Wood, Thomas E., O19483.
 Worthy, Clair M., O39911.
 Wrightson, Samuel H., O39879.
 Yancey, Thomas R., O42256.
 Yanka, Donald E., O30252.
 Yarbrough, Samuel K., Jr., O19460.
 Yost, Harvey J., O42277.
 Young, Charlie L., O51455.
 Young, Stanley A., O51479.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of

branch, arm, or service, in the grades specified:

To be major

Gorn, John W., O22200.

To be captain

Moore, James E., O69992.

To be first lieutenant

Caskey, John T., Jr., O70298.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Congress), section 201, title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 294, 84th Congress:

To be captain

Smith, Milton J., MC.

To be first lieutenants

Blagi, Joseph A., JAGC, O985441.
Bond, John L., Jr., MC, O2276785.
Haight, Robert P., Jr., MC.
Holm, Ruth W., ANC N804384.
Howell, Sharon O., ANC, N805668.
Ivey, Paul E., DC, O2270664.
Lakes, Cecil T., JAGC, O2203778.
McNab, James F., MSC, O1314936.
Mullins, Harold A., DC, O2283492.
Murphy, Eugene J., JAGC, O2266939.
Westerfield, Frank M., MC, O1880743.

To be second lieutenants

Metcalf, Virginia A., AMSC, M2996.
Terry, Frances M., ANC, N901871.
Vollmer, Dorothy A., AMSC, M3020.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 201, title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, subject to completion of internship:

Ball, James J.
Browder, James A.
Gangarosa, Eugene J., O2275558.
Hartvigsen, Robert E.
Johnson, Louis A., O1873898.
Kirkland, Benjamin B., Jr., O2205460.
Miller, Robert E., O2275401.
Moyer, Donald G., O2275579.
Muir, Mark D.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 201, title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, upon receipt of doctor of dental surgery degree:

Kern, Thomas F., O2283105.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenant

Rolya, William I., O1913801.

To be second lieutenants

Chittenden, Richard E., AO2234480.
Greenwalt, James P., O4030908.
Lizardo, Alex R., O4010417.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Beaulieu, John A.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Billups, William H., Jr.	Jones, Dale F.
Boll, Albert F.	Kane, Eugene R.
Budinich, Thomas M., Jr.	Moore, Jack M.
Cel, Peter G., Jr.	Owens, Ronald E.
Ferguson, Lewis L.	Quinlan, Richard J.
Florentino, William J.	Sams, Marion W., Jr.
Garrett, James W.	Tuttle, Donald C.
Hartman, Robert W.	Welch, Larry L.
	Zavadil, Jerome J., Jr.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Harry D. Felt, United States Navy, to be Vice Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy with the rank of admiral.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of section 413 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, Vice Adm. Harry D. Felt, United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him to have the grade, rank, pay and allowances of admiral while so serving.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of section 413 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, the following named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them to have the grade, rank, pay and allowances of vice admiral while so serving:

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy.

Rear Adm. William V. Davis, Jr., United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Stuart S. Murray, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 21, 1956:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Glenn A. Boger, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, term expiring March 31, 1962.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

David A. Hamil, of Colorado, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, term of 10 years.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William G. Juergens, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, who art our refuge and redemption, and whose truth is our light and hope, may we now worship Thee with eager minds and earnest hearts, gratefully acknowledging Thy goodness and our dependence upon Thee.

Emancipate us from all fears and anxieties and inspire us with a greater faith

in Thy immeasurable love which always sustains us and Thy unfathomable care which always surrounds us.

We rejoice that when we are discouraged and disturbed in spirit we may bring our burdens and sorrows unto Thee and carry away a song and receive a new joy which defies despair.

Show us how we may cultivate a more vital and healing sympathy for struggling humanity, a nobler skill in doing good, and a finer art of insight and understanding for all who are baffled and perplexed by life's untoward happenings and vicissitudes.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 101. An act relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 5790. An act relating to the application in the Territory of Hawaii of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act;

H. R. 6782. An act to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 8493. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Womens Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9582. An act to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9671. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio;

H. R. 10374. An act to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 10768. An act to amend section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia," as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3693. An act to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 6243. An act authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7227. An act to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes, to provide that certain Federal surplus property be disposed of to State and local civil defense organizations which are established by or pursuant to State law, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7380. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities;

H. R. 9593. An act to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes;